

under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 593(a) and 3392:

*To be major generals*

Brig. Gen. John Samuel Anderson, O1283632.

Col. Alfred Carlisle Harrison, O311380, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Erwin Case Hostetler, O336226, Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Chester James Moeglein, O384958.

Col. Robert Louis Stevenson, O343589, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Thomas Roberts White, Jr., O348796, Adjutant General's Corps.

*To be brigadier generals*

Col. Donald Nicholas Anderson, O375021, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Mayhew Yale Foster, O307029, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. George Morris Gelston, O1177407, Adjutant General's Corps.

Col. Joseph Thornton Willey, O399386, Adjutant General's Corps.

The following named officers for appointment in the Regular Army of the United States to the grades indicated, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, sections 3284, 3306, and 3307:

*To be major generals*

Maj. Gen. William Winston Lapsley, O19727, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. John Lathrop Throckmorton, O19732, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Dyce Alger, O19848, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ralph Edwards Haines, Jr., O19849, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Vernon Price Mock, O19906, Army of the United States (brigadier general, U.S. Army).

*To be brigadier generals*

Brig. Gen. William Carl Garrison, O30144, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Chester Victor Clifton, Jr., O20246, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. William Charles Haneke, O20263, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Paul Sampson, O42926, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Jackson Graham, O20553, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Edwin Hess Burba, O31518, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Arthur William Oberbeck, O20569, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Douglass Phillip Quandt, O20605, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Robert Francis Seedlock, O20609, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Alexander Day Surles, Jr., O20622, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. John Graham Zierdt, O20632, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. George Vernon Underwood, Jr., O20679, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Albert Ollie Connor, O20699, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Brig. Gen. Woodrow Wilson Stromberg, O20728, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Ferdinand Thomas Unger, O20734, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Benjamin Franklin Taylor, O20779, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. James Howard Skeldon, O20831, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

Maj. Gen. Joe Stallings Lawrie, O20914, Army of the United States (colonel, U.S. Army).

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JULY 18, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Daniel 2: 20: *Blessed be the name of God forever and ever; for wisdom and might are His.*

Almighty God, we earnestly implore Thee that in these times of destiny for our Republic, we may make known to the forces of communism that our Union is one and inseparable.

Grant that we may proclaim to the adversary our conviction that, however we may differ in our philosophy as political parties, we are not a divided nation but that we are all equally determined that nothing will ever be able to undermine our form of government.

May the Members of Congress be men and women who are emulating the example of those patriots and leaders in our national history who served our beloved country with heroic courage and humble fidelity.

Inspire us to dedicate our lives to lofty ambitions, and may we be partners in advancing our Nation's spiritual culture and moral refinement in order that we may truly be a people whose God is the Lord.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Ratchford, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On July 11, 1963:

H.R. 1275. An act for the relief of Miss Ann Super;

H.R. 1292. An act for the relief of Carmela Calabrese DiVito;

H.R. 1332. An act for the relief of Mario Rodrigues Fonseca;

H.R. 1736. An act for the relief of Assunta DiLeila Codella;

H.R. 3356. An act for the relief of Josephine Maria (Bonaccorso) Botelli; and

H.R. 4773. An act for the relief of Leroy Smallegenberger, a referee in bankruptcy.

On July 17, 1963:

H.R. 1267. An act for the relief of Lawrence E. Bird; and

H.R. 6681. An act to improve the active duty promotion opportunity of Air Force officers from the grade of major to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

## WATERSHED PROTECTION AND FLOOD PREVENTION

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk, and which, together with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,  
Washington, D.C., July 17, 1963.

HON. JOHN W. MCCORMACK,  
The Speaker,  
The House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, as amended, the Committee on Agriculture today considered the work plans transmitted to you by executive communication and referred to this committee and unanimously approved each of such plans. The work plans involved are:

State	Watershed	Executive communication number
Nebraska.....	Bear-Pierce.....	895, 88th Cong.
Do.....	Bellwood.....	Do.
Arizona.....	Buckhorn-Mesa.....	Do.
Oklahoma.....	Caney Creek.....	Do.
Florida.....	Istokpoga Marsh.....	641, 88th Cong.
Virginia.....	Johns Creek.....	940, 88th Cong.
Florida.....	Jumper Creek.....	641, 88th Cong.
Oregon.....	Middle Fork of Hood River.....	2423, 87th Cong.
Tennessee.....	Mulberry Creek.....	1899, 87th Cong.
Hawaii.....	Naalahua.....	898, 88th Cong.
Arkansas.....	Tupelo Bayou.....	Do.
West Virginia.....	Upper Deckers Creek.....	940, 88th Cong.
South Dakota.....	Upper Little Minnesota River.....	641, 88th Cong.
Florida.....	Upper Tampa Bay.....	1288, 87th Cong.

Sincerely yours,  
HAROLD D. COOLEY,  
Chairman.

## BALANCE OF PAYMENTS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 141)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

## To the Congress of the United States:

Soon after my inauguration, I reported to the Congress on the problems presented to this Nation by 3 successive years, beginning in the late 1950's, of mounting balance-of-payments deficits accompanied by large gold outflows; and I announced a program designed to restore both confidence in the dollar and eventual equilibrium in our international accounts. The challenge posed by those pressures was heightened at that time by the need to halt and reverse the spread of unemployment and revive our faltering economy. Rejecting a choice between two equally unpalatable alternatives—improved employment at home at the cost of a weaker dollar abroad or a stronger dollar at the cost of a weaker economy and Nation—we sought a new course that would simultaneously increase our growth at home, reduce unemployment and strengthen the dollar by eliminating the deficit in our international payments. It is appropriate

now—nearly 2½ years later—to look back on the problems faced, to review the progress made and to chart the course ahead.

There is much from which to take heart. Our economy has resumed its growth and unemployment has been reduced. The dollar remains strong, bolstered by nearly 40 percent of the free world's monetary gold stock as well as by a newly constructed network of bilateral and multilateral financial arrangements. Our gold outflow has been halved. There are signs of longer run improvement in our world competitive position, as our prices and costs hold steady while others are rising. The deficit in our balance of payments has been reduced—from \$3.9 billion in 1960 to \$2.4 billion in 1961 and \$2.2 billion in 1962.

Our basic strength, moreover, is vast, real, and enduring. Our payments deficits, measured in terms of our loss of gold and the increase in our short-term liquid liabilities to foreigners, have consistently been equaled or exceeded by the growth of our long-term, high-yielding foreign assets—assets which have been and will continue to be an increasing source of strength to our balance of payments. Today, Americans hold more than \$60 billion of private investments abroad, and dollar loans repayable to the U.S. Government total over \$11 billion. At the end of 1962, all of these assets exceeded our liabilities to foreigners by an estimated \$27 billion. And they have shown an increasing strength over the years: Our total income from these sources in 1959 was \$3 billion; in 1962 it had risen to \$4.3 billion; and we expect further substantial increases in the coming years.

These are all signs of progress. But unemployment is still too high; our growth rate is still too low; and it is now clear that, despite the favorable forces at work over the long run, more remains to be done today to eliminate the continuing payments deficit.

A significant portion of our progress so far has been due to special agreements with friendly foreign countries—for debt prepayments, advance payments for military equipment, and U.S. borrowings abroad. While similar arrangements may once again prove capable of covering a substantial amount of the gross deficit in 1963, such special transactions cannot be relied upon for the indefinite future. Moreover, while our commercial trade balance and Government expenditures overseas have shown modest improvement, capital outflows, both short term and long term have increased.

Although there is urgent need for further effort I want to make it clear that, in solving its international payments problem, this Nation will continue to adhere to its historic advocacy of freer trade and capital movements, and that it will continue to honor its obligation to carry a fair share of the defense and development of the free world. At the same time, we shall continue policies designed to reduce unemployment and stimulate growth here at home—for the well-being of all free peoples is inextricably

entwined with the progress achieved by our own people. I want to make it equally clear that this Nation will maintain the dollar as good as gold, freely interchangeable with gold at \$35 an ounce, the foundation stone of the free world's trade and payments system.

But continued confidence at home and cooperation abroad require further administrative and legislative inroads into the hard core of our continuing payments deficit—augmenting our long-range efforts to improve our economic performance over a period of years in order to achieve both external balance and internal expansion—stepping up our shorter run efforts to reduce our balance-of-payments deficits while the long-range forces are at work—and adding to our stockpile of arrangements designed to finance our deficits during our return to equilibrium in a way that assures the continued smooth functioning of the world's monetary and trade systems.

Before turning to the specific measures required in the latter two categories, I must emphasize once again the necessity of improving this Nation's overall long-range economic performance—including increased investment and modernization for greater productivity and profits, continued cost and price stability and full employment and faster growth. This is the key to improving our international competitiveness, increasing our trade surpluses and reducing our capital outflows.

That is why early enactment of the comprehensive tax reduction and revision program previously submitted is the single most important step that can be taken to achieve balance abroad as well as growth here at home. The increased investment incentives and purchasing power these personal and corporate tax reductions would create—combined with last year's actions giving special credits for new investment and more favorable depreciation treatment—will promote more employment, production, sales and investment, particularly when accompanied by the continued ample availability of credit and reasonable long-term rates of interest. A prosperous, high-investment economy brings with it the rapid gains in productivity and efficiency which are so essential to the improvement of our competitive position abroad.

To gain new markets abroad and retain the gains of new growth and efficiency here at home, we must continue the price-cost stability of recent years, limiting wage and profit increases to their fair share of our improving productivity. That is why we have, for 2 years, been urging business and labor to recognize and use reasonable wage-price guideposts for resolving the issues of collective bargaining. Our success in holding down our price level relative to that of our major competitors is a powerful force working to restore our payments balance over the longer run. This fact should not be obscured by current short-run developments.

While these long-range forces are taking effect, a series of more immediate and specialized efforts are needed to

reduce the deficit in our international transactions and defend our gold reserves:

#### 1. EXPORT EXPANSION

Our commercial sales of goods and services to foreign countries in 1962 exceeded our purchases by \$4.3 billion, and they are continuing at about the same rate this year. This is our greatest strength, but it is not enough. Our exports of goods have risen only moderately over the past 3 years, and have not kept pace with the rapid rise of imports which has accompanied our domestic expansion. As a result, rather than furnishing increased support for our other transactions, 1962 saw a decline in our commercial trade surplus.

The primary long-term means for correcting this situation is implementation of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962. The special representative for trade negotiations is preparing to use to the fullest extent the authority given to me by the act, in an across-the-board drive for lower tariffs and against other barriers to trade. This should open new markets and widen existing markets for American exports.

As mentioned above, our whole long-range domestic program—including increased investment, improved productivity and wage-price stability—is designed to better the competitive position of our products both at home and abroad. Continued price stability at home, contrasted with the upward trend in prices abroad, will create an increasingly favorable climate for American exports; and this administration is concentrating on six immediate measures to help American businessmen take advantage of our export potential.

First, the Export-Import Bank has created a wholly new program of export financing which now provides U.S. business with credit facilities equal to any in the world. The major element in this new program is the guarantee of short- and medium-term export credits by the Foreign Credit Insurance Association, composed of more than 70 private insurance companies in conjunction with the Export-Import Bank. I urge the Congress to act promptly to restore the Bank to full operating efficiency by renewing its charter and authorizing adequate financing.

Second, the Departments of State and Commerce have strengthened and expanded efforts overseas to probe for new markets and promote the sale and distribution of American products.

Third, the Department of Commerce has developed a broad program of education and assistance to present any potential American exporters. I have requested a relatively small amount of additional funds to strengthen the Department's efforts to stimulate our exports. These funds, amounting to \$6 million, were not approved by the House of Representatives. It is essential, if we are to increase our trade surplus, that they be included in the final appropriation bill. This modest sum would pay for itself many times over in increased exports, lower payments deficits, and protection for our gold reserves.



Fourth, the Department of Agriculture announced last March a new auction program for direct sales of cotton abroad. It is expected that this new technique will insure competitive pricing for our cotton in export markets and will increase exports by as much as \$100 million over last year's levels.

Fifth, present ocean freight rates discourage our exports as compared to imports. The freight charges on Atlantic crossings are far higher for eastbound freight than for comparable items bound for our shores. A similar situation prevails on other trade routes. While these substantial differentials may have been acceptable in the immediate postwar period of the dollar shortage when Europe was struggling to get on its feet, their magnitude is clearly unjustified today. Accordingly, I have directed the Secretary of Commerce to take corrective action through the Maritime Administration; and, I am urging the Federal Maritime Commission in its role as an independent regulatory agency to question those specific export rates which appear unduly high. Should legislation prove necessary, it will be sought.

Sixth, in order to give further momentum to the expansion of our export performances, I will convene a White House Conference on Export Expansion on September 17 and 18, to alert American firms, whether or not they are now exporting, to the opportunities and rewards of initiating or expanding export efforts. We shall use this opportunity to emphasize to American businessmen that vigorous action to increase their exports would serve their own private interests as well as the national interest.

## 2. TOURISM

Another element that requires attention in our commercial transactions is the increase in our unfavorable net tourist balance. With increasing prosperity encouraging American travel abroad, total tourist spending in foreign countries rose another 10 percent last year, to nearly \$2½ billion. This was partially offset by increased foreign tourist expenditures in the United States, but the net result was an outflow of \$1.4 billion, or two-thirds of last year's overall balance-of-payments deficit. This year the cost is estimated to be still greater. That is why we have had to limit the duty-free exemption for returning tourists to \$100 per person. Last year this measure achieved a saving of more than \$100 million, and I am gratified that Congress has extended the limitation for another 2 years. We have also sought, through establishment of the U.S. Travel Service, to increase our income from visitors coming to our country. To further that effort, I strongly recommend that Congress approve the full amount of the appropriation requested for the U.S. Travel Service.

In addition, in cooperation with the appropriate government agencies, I am asking the domestic travel and tourism industry to launch a more unified drive to encourage Americans to learn more about their own country and the glory of their heritage. A see-America-now program, to be in full operation by the spring of 1964, will make the most of

our magnificent resources and make travel at home a more appealing alternative to travel abroad.

## 3. FEDERAL EXPENDITURES ABROAD

Federal expenditures abroad go largely for defense and aid. These represent the obligations which flow from our position of world leadership and unrivaled economic strength. With the recovery of other economically advanced nations, particularly our allies in Western Europe, we have made vigorous and increasingly successful efforts to work out with them a better sharing of our common responsibilities. These efforts—combined with rigorous scrutiny of offshore expenditures—have enabled us, in spite of mounting worldwide requirements and costs, to reduce the overall total of our own overseas expenditures while we increase the security of the free world and maintain a high level of assistance to developing countries.

A continual process of modernizing our Armed Forces and increasing efficiency, resulting in heightened defense effectiveness, is reducing the requirements for overseas dollar expenditures. At the same time, by tying our aid more effectively to domestic procurement and cutting civilian expenditures sharply, we should be able to achieve further savings. In fact, by January 1965, these processes should result in a reduction of the rate of our Federal overseas dollar expenditures by approximately \$1 billion from that of 1962.

### (A) MILITARY EXPENDITURES

The Defense Department has, since the beginning of this administration, been making vigorous efforts to restrain overseas expenditures, without reducing military effectiveness.

Thus, despite the Berlin buildup of 1961 and rising costs overseas, gross expenditures abroad by the Defense Department have been held below 1960 levels. As a result of the desire of our allies to acquire from us modern military equipment, which they need to strengthen free world defenses, at lower cost than they could produce the equipment themselves, substantial offsets to these expenditures have also been achieved, so that our net outlays abroad for defense have declined from \$2.7 billion in 1960 to \$1.9 billion in 1962.

In line with these continuing efforts, the Secretary of Defense has informed me that the annual rate of expenditures abroad by the Department of Defense will be reduced—by measures to be put into effect before the end of calendar year 1964—by more than \$300 million from the 1962 level. At the same time the Department of Defense will continue to seek arrangements with major allied countries to increase their military procurement from the United States so as to reduce the net outflow still further. The Secretary has further assured me that this reduction will be accomplished without any reduction in the effectiveness of our military posture and with no impairment in our ability to meet our commitments to our allies in all parts of the world.

In addition to direct expenditures by the Defense Department our defense expenditures abroad have for many years

been increased by the cost of programs for the acquisition of strategic materials from foreign sources. The cost of these programs is now steadily declining since they have largely fulfilled their purpose and are no longer needed. Within 2 years they will be reduced by over \$200 million as compared to 1962, ensuring a total reduction in defense dollar expenditures well in excess of \$500 million.

### (B) AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

During 1960 only about one-third of AID program expenditures were in the form of U.S. goods and services. Last year that proportion had risen to about 50 percent. But during the fiscal year which ended last month, fully 80 percent of AID's commitments were "tied" to the export of U.S. goods and services. The balance was virtually all committed for purchases in the less developed countries rather than in the developed nations where the payments surpluses exist which give rise to our deficit. During fiscal year 1964, for which funds are now being considered by the Congress, AID commitments tied to U.S. exports will rise beyond 80 percent of the total. I have directed the Administrator of AID to continue and intensify this policy so that AID expenditures entering our balance of payments in fiscal year 1965 may be further reduced by about \$500 million as compared to fiscal year 1961, from about \$1 billion to not over \$500 million, the lowest practicable minimum.

### (C) OTHER DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The overseas disbursements of all other departments of Government have also been brought under special review and control by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Total Federal expenditures abroad (excluding Defense, AID, Treasury payments on foreign-held debt and Federal pension payments) coming within the scope of this review now amount to approximately \$600 million per year. The Director of the Budget has assured me that vigorous screening of expenditures abroad by these other Federal departments and agencies will achieve further substantial balance-of-payments savings. These savings, together with those which may be expected from revisions of programs under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act, should amount to some \$100 million a year. This includes my request to the Congress to enact legislation permitting freer use of our present holdings of the currencies of a number of other countries.

### 4. SHORT-TERM CAPITAL FLOWS

By skillful use of the tools of debt management and monetary policy, the Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve System have substantially reduced the outflow of short-term capital through a series of carefully managed increases in short-term money rates, while maintaining ample credit availability and keeping both long-term rates and bank loan rates low and, in many cases, declining. Experience in the recovery underway over the past 2½ years provides a solid basis for expecting that a determined effort can succeed in keeping long-term investment and mortgage

money plentiful and cheap while boosting short-term interest rates. From February 1961 through July 12, 1963, the rate on newly issued 3-month Treasury bills rose 76 basis points, while the rise in long-term Treasury bond yields was held to only 22 basis points, and the yields on high-grade corporate bonds and mortgages actually declined.

However, the recorded outflows of short-term funds—together with unrecorded net outflows, a large portion of which undoubtedly represent short-term capital movements—still amounted to approximately \$1.6 billion in 1962 and have continued on a substantial scale so far this year. A sizable reduction in this drain would do much to strengthen our overall balance of payments. It is for this reason that the Federal Reserve has decided to increase the rediscount rate from 3 to 3½ percent. At the same time, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation have raised the interest-rate ceilings on time deposits payable in 90 days to 1 year, in order to enable our banks to compete more effectively with those abroad and thus attract funds that might otherwise leave the country.

While none of us welcomes higher interest rates at a time when our economy is operating below capacity, an increase in short-term rates—at a time when liquid savings are growing rapidly, and when there are no accompanying restrictions on credit availability nor parallel increases in the interest rates on bank loans, home mortgages, or other long-term obligations—should have little, if any, adverse effect on our economy. The unprecedented flow of liquid savings should largely insulate the longer term markets from the effect of higher short-term rates. I have been assured by both Treasury and Federal Reserve officials that they intend to do everything possible through debt management policy and open-market operations to avoid any reduction in domestic credit availability and any upward pressure on long-term interest rates while the economy operates below capacity without inflation. Other agencies of the Federal Government will work to maintain continued ready availability of private mortgage loans at stable interest rates. Nevertheless, the situation lends increased urgency to the fiscal stimulus that would be provided by the prompt enactment of the substantial tax reductions I have recommended.

5. Long-term capital outflows consisting of direct investment in productive plants abroad appear to have leveled off in recent years, whereas portfolio investments in the form of long-term loans or securities purchases have been rising rapidly. While our long-range program should increase the attractiveness of domestic investment and further reduce the outflow of direct investment, the rising outflow of long-term capital for portfolio investment abroad shows no sign of abating. It is up from \$850 million in 1960 to \$1.2 billion in 1962, and so far this year is running at an annual rate of well over \$1.5 billion.

In view of the continued existence of direct controls and inadequate capital market mechanisms in many foreign countries, and the wide differential between the long-term rates of interest in the larger industrial countries and the United States, there appear to be only three possible solutions to this problem, two of which are unacceptable under present circumstances:

A substantial increase in our whole long-term interest rate structure would throw our economy into reverse, increase unemployment and substantially reduce our import requirements, thereby damaging the economy of every free nation;

The initiation of direct capital controls, which are in use in most countries, is inappropriate to our circumstances. It is contrary to our basic precept of free markets. We cannot take this route.

A third alternative—the one which I recommend—would stem the flood of foreign security sales in our markets and still be fully consistent with both economic growth and free capital movements. I urge the enactment by the Congress of an "interest equalization tax," which would, in effect, increase by approximately 1 percent the interest cost to foreigners of obtaining capital in this country, and thus help equalize interest rate patterns for longer term financing in the United States and abroad. The rate of tax should be graduated from 2.75 percent to 15 percent of the value of debt obligations, according to the remaining maturity of the obligation, and should be 15 percent in the case of equity securities. This tax should remain in effect through 1965 when improvements in both our balance of payments and in the operation of foreign capital markets are expected to permit its abandonment.

Under this alternative, the allocation of savings for investment in securities will continue to be the result of decisions based on market prices. There will be no limitations on the marketing of foreign issues and no governmental screening of borrowers. Reliance will be placed on price alone to effect an overall reduction in the outflow of American funds for stocks, bonds, and long-term loans—both new or outstanding, whether publicly marketed or privately placed.

The tax would not apply to direct investment. It would not apply to securities or loans that mature in less than 3 years. Nor would it apply to the loans of commercial banks. These exemptions will assure that export credit will remain fully available. Furthermore, purchases of the securities of less developed countries or of companies operating primarily in such countries will not be taxed.

Nor will the tax apply to transactions in foreign securities already owned by Americans, or to the purchase of securities by foreigners. Underwriters and dealers would be exempted from the tax on stock or securities resold to foreigners as part of the distribution of a new issue. But all Americans who purchase new or outstanding foreign securities from foreign issuers or owners would be subject to this tax. In order to avoid unfair burdens on transactions which are

nearly complete, the tax should not apply to offerings of securities for which active registration statements are now on file with the Securities and Exchange Commission. Purchase commitments which have already been made should also not be affected.

The Secretary of the Treasury is submitting the details of this proposal to the Congress; and I have been assured that the House Ways and Means Committee will be prepared to give high priority to this proposal after action has been taken with respect to the overall program of tax reduction and reform now before it. Since the effectiveness of this tax requires its immediate application, I am asking Congress to make the legislation effective from the date of this message. The Internal Revenue Service will promptly make available all instructions necessary for interim fulfillment of the provisions of this recommendation, pending the enactment of legislation by the Congress.

6. Investment by foreign savers in the securities of U.S. private companies has fallen rapidly to less than \$150 million in 1962. The better climate for investment that will flow from enactment of the program for tax reduction and reform now before the Congress will do much to improve this situation but a direct action program is also needed to promote overseas sales of securities of U.S. companies. Such a program should also be designed to increase foreign participation in the financing of new or expanded operations on the part of U.S. companies operating abroad.

To meet these two facets of a single problem, a new and positive program should be directed to the following areas of effort:

(a) The identification and critical appraisal of the legal, administrative and institutional restrictions remaining in the capital markets of other industrial nations of the free world which prevent the purchase of American securities and hamper U.S. companies in financing their operations abroad from non-U.S. sources;

(b) A review of U.S. Government and private activities which adversely affect foreign purchase of the securities of U.S. private companies; and

(c) A broad and intensive effort by the U.S. financial community to market securities of U.S. private companies to foreign investors, and to increase the availability of foreign financing for U.S. business operating abroad.

Such a program will necessarily involve a pooling of the know-how and efforts of the Government and the financial community. I have asked the Treasury Department, in consultation with the State Department, to develop an organization plan and program.

The increased freedom of capital movement and increased participation by foreign citizens and financial institutions in the ownership and financing of American business, toward which these efforts are directed, will serve to strengthen the economic and political ties of the free world as well as its monetary system. Securities of U.S. private



firms could be and should be one of our best selling exports. An increasing foreign investment in these securities will encourage a more balanced two-way capital traffic between the United States and other capital markets and minimize the impact of net long-term capital outflows from the United States on our balance of payments.

7. Special Government transactions covered \$1.4 billion of our deficit in 1962. These included prepayment of debt by foreign countries, advance payments on military purchases here, and the issuance by the Treasury of medium-term securities to foreign official holders of dollars. Further debt prepayment is expected in 1963—France has just announced a prepayment of \$160 million—but it is clear that these are temporary gains which cannot be repeated for very long. Nor is it likely that advance payments on military purchases will again be large, as the pace of deliveries against purchases is now rising.

Therefore, as our continuing balance-of-payments deficit leads to accruals of dollars by foreign central banks, exceeding the size of the dollar balances which they normally carry, it has been particularly helpful that a number of foreign governments and central banks have begun purchasing a new type of non-marketable medium-term Treasury security, denominated either in dollars or in their own currencies, as a convenient alternative to the purchase of gold. Some \$610 million of such securities have been newly issued thus far in 1963.

Further debt prepayments and further sales of these securities during the remainder of this year will reflect the unprecedented degree of cooperation now prevailing in international finance and the growing recognition that correction of payments imbalances is a responsibility of the surplus as well as the deficit countries. In this spirit we shall also continue to press for a fuller and fairer sharing of the burdens of defense and aid and for the reduction or elimination of the trade barriers which impede our exports.

8. Gold sales and increased dollar holdings serve to finance what remains of our deficit after special governmental transactions. In 1962, this deficit amounted to approximately \$2.2 billion. It was financed by the sale of \$890 million in gold and \$17 million of our holdings of foreign exchange as well as by an increase in foreign holdings of dollars and U.S. Government securities amounting to \$653 million, and an increase of \$626 million in the holdings of dollars by the International Monetary Fund.

The total outflow of gold for the 2 years 1961 and 1962 combined only slightly exceeded the outflow in the single year 1960; and the outflow in 1963 is running at a rate well below last year. Since the rise in short-term interest rates resulting from the recent action of the Federal Reserve will make it considerably more attractive for foreigners to hold their assets in dollars, including short-term U.S. Government securities, prospects are improved that increased foreign holdings of these assets instead of gold will finance a still larger share of our deficit.

9. The International Monetary Fund, however, presents a different situation. Last year the Fund's dollar holdings increased as other countries paid off their debts in dollars and concentrated new borrowings in other convertible currencies to the extent practicable. But the Fund's rules provide that, except in the case of a drawing—that is, a borrowing—it cannot hold more of any currency than was paid in at the time of original subscription (in effect, 75 percent); and the Fund's holdings of dollars have now nearly reached that level.

To meet this situation the United States has requested and the Executive Board of the IMF has approved a \$500 million standby arrangement which authorizes us to draw on the Fund from time to time during the coming year. It is our intention to utilize this authority for the purpose of facilitating repayments which are expected to total about \$500 million during the course of the next 12 months. When a country desires to repay the Fund, we will draw convertible foreign currencies from the Fund, paying for them with dollars. The country making the repayment will use its own dollars to buy these foreign currencies from us in order to repay the Fund. All transfers will take place at par. Thus the Fund will continue to finance a portion of our deficit by increasing its holdings of dollars and its various debtors will continue to have a simple and costless method by which they can redeem their obligations to the Fund. The alternative under present circumstances, now that they cannot pay off directly in dollars, would have been either to buy gold from the United States with which to repay the Fund, or to purchase other convertible currencies in the market with their dollars at extra cost and inconvenience.

Drawings by the United States under this new arrangement will be repayable in 3 years, with a 2-year extension available if needed. No interest will be payable, but the drawings will be subject to a one-time service charge of one-half of 1 percent.

#### 10. EVOLUTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY SYSTEM

During the past 2 years great progress has been made in strengthening the basic fabric of the international monetary system upon which the whole free world depends. Far closer cooperation among the central banks of the leading industrial countries has been achieved. Reciprocal credit arrangements have been established to meet instantly any disruptive disturbance to international payments—arrangements which successfully contained the monetary repercussions of the Berlin crisis in 1961, the heavy pressure on the Canadian dollar in the spring of 1962, the Cuban crisis last autumn, the reaction that followed the exclusion of the United Kingdom from the Common Market, and a number of less striking events that might, in other years, have set off dangerous rounds of currency speculation. An informal but highly effective operating relationship has grown up among a number of the same countries with respect to the London gold market, ruling out

for the future any repetition of the alarming rise in the price of gold which created such uncertainty in October 1960. Finally, 10 of the leading industrial countries have established a \$6 billion facility for providing supplemental resources to the International Monetary Fund, which will be available in the event of any threat to the stability of the international monetary system.

The net result has been to provide strong defenses against successful raids on a major currency. Our efforts to strengthen these defenses will continue. While this process is taking place, the United States will continue to study and discuss with other countries measures which might be taken for a further strengthening of the international monetary system over the longer run. The U.S. interest in the continuing evolution of the system inaugurated at the time of Bretton Woods is not a result of our current payments deficit—rather it reflects our concern that adequate provision be made for the growth of international liquidity to finance expanding world trade over the years ahead. Indeed, one of the reasons that new sources of liquidity may well be needed is that, as we close our payments gap, we will cut down our provision of dollars to the rest of the world.

As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely; we shall be discussing possible improvements with our friends abroad; and our minds will be open to their initiatives. We share their view that the problem of improving the payments mechanism is one that demands careful joint deliberation. At the same time, we do not pretend that talk of long-range reform of the system is any substitute for the actions that we ourselves must take now.

#### THE PROMISE OF THE FUTURE

Full implementation of the program of action I have outlined today should lead to substantial improvement in our international payments. The rate of Government expenditures abroad will drop by \$900 million over the next 18 months, and the combined effect of the increase in short-term interest rates and the interest equalization tax should equal, and more probably exceed, this figure. Gains of this magnitude—approximately \$2 billion—will give us the time our basic long-term program needs to improve our international competitive position, and increase the attraction for investment in the United States.

These two objectives must be the basis of any permanent closing of the payments gap, and this program will achieve them without threatening our growth at home. It will also do so without compromising our adherence to the principles of freer trade and free movements of capital. It will, in fact, help prevent pressures for more restrictive measures. In short, while we must intensify our efforts, we can do so with full confidence in the future.

JOHN F. KENNEDY.

THE WHITE HOUSE, July 18, 1963.

## PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, the President, despite the lengthy analysis, skirted the basic problems at the heart of the situation. The President seeks to cure the results of Federal control by more Federal regulation and control.

Capitalism, the private enterprise system, thrives on freedom, not Federal intervention. The tax he proposes on the flow of money is no solution.

Why does not the President and his advisers turn instead to fiscal responsibility? The President and his deficit financing advisers have forgotten the reasons for and the need for a federally balanced budget, reduction of debt, and straightforward reduction of taxes including tax rate reduction, instead of the fuzzy tortuous Presidential tax reform recommendations.

If the President really wants to reduce the imbalance of payments why does he not stop giving our money away. While we have the greatest debt in the world we continue to give foreign aid all over the world. Even our increased exports are recognized to be the result largely of our own subsidy. We give foreign nations money and they buy from us. This is artificial growth. Further, that money remaining in foreign hands can be converted into our gold at their discretion. Is it any wonder that foreign nations have built up such dollar reserves, callable in gold? Indeed, in many instances foreign nations have refused to lower their tariffs after agreeing to do so to match our reduction because they have pleaded dollar shortage. Our foreign giveaway and disproportionate support of the U.N. are instances of our inability to live within our means and exercise financial self-discipline.

It is high time the new frontiersmen and other new socialists including our President, Schlesinger, Heller, Galbraith, and others realize the imbalance of payments result from the big spending policies, deficit financing, government in business and the increasing regulation and control of our society by Federal Government, under the liberal-radical democrats.

## THE PROBLEM OF OUR OUTFLOWING GOLD RESERVES

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, we are vitally concerned with the problem of our outflowing gold reserves. It is no wonder we are losing gold, and our Western European allies are building gold reserves, when we look

at the amount of money this Nation is spending on the defense of Western Europe. The facts become startling when U.S. spending for defense in Europe is compared to the share our wealthy European allies are spending.

During the 10-year period 1953-63, U.S. gold reserves have dwindled from \$22.1 to \$15.9 billion as of March 1963. By comparison, Belgium's gold reserves have risen from \$0.8 billion in 1953 to \$1.4 billion as of March 1963. France's gold reserves were \$0.6 billion in 1953, and have risen to \$2.7 billion now. West Germany has come from \$0.3 to \$3.7 billion in reserves. For Italy the figures are \$0.3 to \$2.3 billion. Netherlands has risen from \$0.7 to \$1.6 billion, while the United Kingdom has come from \$2 billion in 1955 to \$2.6 billion in gold reserves at the end of 1962.

Let us compare the percentage of total government expenditures which these nations spend on defense. The United States spends some 59.1 percent of all Government spending on defense. By comparison, Belgium spends only 12.9 percent, France only 27.7 percent, West Germany 26.6 percent, Italy only 14 percent, Netherlands 19.9 percent, and Great Britain spends some 22 percent on defense.

Mr. Speaker, our military contributions to NATO have continued, our gold reserves have been falling. I am sure the American people agree that our rich European allies should begin to bear more of the cost of their own defense, and I urge that negotiations begin soon in order that this burden will be more equitably shared.

## COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON COMMUNICATIONS AND POWER

Mr. ROGERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Communications and Power of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PRICE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

## EXTENSION OF PUBLIC LAW 78

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include an article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry yesterday approved a 1-year extension of Public Law 78, the Mexican labor law. While the enactment of a 1-year program would be heartening to many farmers, ranchmen, Mexican workers, and the general consuming public, authority for more than 1 crop year should be enacted into law. The non-partisan approach of a 3-year phase out

introduced by my colleague, Representative TEAGUE of California, as well as many other Members of the House, including myself, is the more feasible approach and should be enacted speedily into law. The large number of employees of the Department of Labor who are engaged in administering this program want to know what the future holds for them. They are entitled to an answer so that they may know where they will be stationed for another year. The children of these compliance officers ought to be considered as well, as September school opening approaches.

Emil Zubryn, staff correspondent for the Cotton Trade Journal wrote an article entitled, "Failure To Extend Program for Braceros Brings Divergent Reactions in Mexico." This article appeared in the Cotton Trade Journal on June 7, 1963 and is worthy of the attention and consideration of this House.

The article is as follows:

## FAILURE TO EXTEND PROGRAM FOR BRACEROS BRINGS DIVERGENT REACTIONS IN MEXICO

(By Emil Zubryn)

MEXICO CITY, June 1.—The refusal of the U.S. Congress to renew the bracero agreement beyond the end of this year has brought divergent reactions here.

On the one hand, the Mexican Department of Interior said the action will not seriously affect the Mexican economy or cause serious unemployment. Displaced workers can be absorbed by Mexican industry, a spokesman said.

In any case, according to the Department of State, hiring of braceros has been on the decline since 1961, when the total came to 296,225 workers. Last year this dropped to 198,322 and this year's total may plunge below 150,000.

## OPPOSED EXODUS

Francisco Hernandez y Hernandez, formerly head of the National Farmers Federation, said this organization has always opposed the exodus of Mexican farmworkers who he said are needed here. Senator Alberto Medina Munoz, of Nayarit, expressed a similar stand.

Secretary of State Gustavo Diaz Ordaz said that if the bracero movement is stopped it also will create "problems" for the United States.

He said that any extension will only be considered by Mexico if certain basic requisites are met: improved salaries, living conditions, food, transport, medical service, etc.

## ADVERSE EFFECTS

Mexico, however, will have some adverse effects if the bracero program is definitely ended. Officials estimate that around \$35 million was earned by braceros last year, with an average of around this in the past 3 years.

It could also create employment problems. There is already talk of creating regional labor banks to siphon off excess Mexican farm labor into needed areas, or into industry.

As for the bracero himself, he was stunned by the news and by the loss of an opportunity to work in the United States from 6 weeks to 3 or 4 months.

## PROBLEM AGGRAVATED

Many take the attitude that "nobody gives us work here and in rural areas the best lands are for influential well financed farmers, or for the favored few who have political backing."

The problem is aggravated further by the fact that in Mexico firms are hesitant to hire anyone over 35 years of age. Many braceros are in the 40-to-50-year age group.



Some political leaders view the entire situation with alarm, feel that it could lead to trouble in agricultural communities.

In general, the hope is that American authorities will reconsider and that the bracero agreement will be extended for at least 2 additional years.

#### THE KENNEDY WALL

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have just obtained permission to address the House for 1 hour this afternoon, which I intend to do, on the President's message on balance of payments. In essence we have here a proposal to build the Kennedy wall to keep investment dollars from flowing to a freer economic climate. I suggest the best way to keep dollars or people from fleeing to freer areas is to free up the area which we are concerned about. The way to keep dollars here in the United States and encourage investment dollars to come here is to create the kind of investment climate that will encourage them to come and to stay here. The President has not directed his attention to this critical matter.

#### RAISES IN EXECUTIVE SALARIES

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, later on this afternoon I have a special order which I am sure will make interesting reading for the Members in tomorrow's RECORD.

Earlier in the year the President requested raises in executive salaries and there was considerable talk about the possibility of Members of Congress even raising their own salaries. I asked the Library of Congress to prepare for me a list of all those public officials, State, local, and Federal, whose salaries equal or exceed the \$22,500 currently paid Members of Congress. The report from the Library of Congress was so inadequate and incomplete that we took it upon ourselves to do a much more thorough job in our office, and I believe we have a much more comprehensive report, which I will include in my remarks this afternoon. Included in the report will be a bibliography of the source material although I am sorry that of this date we are still waiting on the reports from 15 of the 50 States contacted. The list of public officials having salaries equal to or in excess of Members of Congress at the local and State level is indeed impressive and will make interesting reading for you all I am sure.

I do want to pay special tribute to Miss Mary Ann Jennings, of Peoria, Ill., a University of Wisconsin political science intern working in my office during the summer for her fine job in getting most of the material together for this report.

#### LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM FOR THE WEEK OF JULY 22

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the program for next week.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Monday is District day, and five bills from the Committee on the District of Columbia will be considered. They are:

H.R. 6128, record of stockholders of life insurance companies.

H.R. 6350, dental hygienists licensing examinations.

H.R. 6353, unemployment compensation information for District of Columbia Department of Public Welfare.

S. 489, amending small claims procedures before District of Columbia Court of general sessions.

S. 490, eliminating duplicate District of Columbia motor vehicle lien file.

I have also been advised by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HAYS] that he will call up from the Committee on House Administration four bills regarding printing:

H.R. 7043, to provide that certain proceedings of the Veterans of World War I of the United States, Inc., shall be printed as a House document;

House Concurrent Resolution 194, to authorize the printing of 322,500 additional copies of the "Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag";

House Resolution 428, to authorize the printing of additional copies of the study entitled "The Federal Government and Education"; and

Senate Concurrent Resolution 47, to authorize the printing for the use of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary of additional copies of its hearings on "Effects on Young People of Violence and Crime Portrayed on Television."

On Tuesday, H.R. 7356, to amend title 10, United States Code, relating to the nomination and selection of candidates for appointment to the Military, Naval and Air Force Academies.

For Wednesday and the balance of the week:

H.R. 7195, Federal-Aid Highway Act amendments of 1963.

H.R. 6518, Clean Air Act.

H.R. 4638, Presidential Transition Act of 1963.

This announcement, of course, is made subject to the general reservation that any further program may be announced later and that conference reports may be brought up at any time.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HALLECK. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ALBERT. I take this time, Mr. Speaker, to advise the House that upon the conclusion of the legislative pro-

gram for today, if it is concluded today, we will ask unanimous consent to go over until Monday.

#### DISPENSING WITH BUSINESS ON CALENDAR WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule may be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

#### BALANCE OF PAYMENTS

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the President's special message on the balance-of-payments problem. Toward the end of that message you will find this statement:

As yet, this Government is not prepared to recommend any specific prescription for long-term improvement of the international monetary system. But we are studying the matter closely.

Then we go back to October 31, 1960, when Candidate Kennedy made a speech in Philadelphia, Pa., on the balance-of-payments problem and I recommend it to you for your reading, with much of which I agree.

On page 825 of the report that carries these speeches of Candidate Kennedy, he says this:

The President himself echoes this alarm. Yet despite these warnings, and the clear trend of the preceding years, we failed to take prompt and vigorous action, and the balance of payments continued to go against us.

What then must we do, what would a new Democratic administration do to reverse the present downward trend in our balance of payments?

And he lists a few.

First. It says, and it is strangely missing from President Kennedy's message today.

Quoting Candidate Kennedy he asks:

What will a new Democratic administration's policy include?

First, we are pledged to maintain a balanced budget except in times of national emergency or severe recession.

This fact is missing in today's speech. I respectfully suggest that President Kennedy read Candidate Kennedy's speech on balance of payments. I submit that the deficits of the administration contribute greatly to the balance-of-payments problem.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

#### CODE OF ETHICS

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the

House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been 5 years since the Congress approved the concurrent resolution which has become known as the code of ethics for Government employees. Since it was introduced by our distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Florida, the Honorable CHARLES E. BENNETT, it has become a standard of conduct for public servants, elected and otherwise, in all three branches of our Government.

So often, however, Mr. Speaker, the public forgets the codes by which men serve, and for this reason, I consider it appropriate for the Members of this body to reemphasize and reaffirm their concurrence in the principles set forth by this resolution. Although the earlier resolution adopted by the Congress covered all Government employees, it was generally believed to apply chiefly to employees of the executive branch of the Government. I want to particularly stress in this new resolution the application of this code of ethics to members of the legislative branch as well.

I therefore am introducing legislation reaffirming that the code of ethics does apply to all Government employees.

#### CODE OF ETHICS FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate our beloved colleague for his insistence upon the maintenance of the highest possible standards in Government and that these principles apply in the Halls of Congress. He sets a good example in this himself.

The "Code of Ethics for Government Service," by its very terms applies to any person in Government service and to Members of the House and Senate. Its legislative history also shows this. It would, however, serve a very useful purpose to pass another resolution to emphasize this, as our colleague has proposed.

Although the code does have some teeth to it, because people can be hired and fired for ethical default and this code is considered in such and other disciplinary matters, it is my opinion that much ethical progress can be achieved in our Government if Congress passes a measure providing for a tribunal of some sort to hear and decide ethical questions and specific cases. I have been sponsoring legislation which would do this, House Joint Resolution 76. I have also introduced House Resolution 322 which provides a grievance committee in the House to handle specific problems which arise here. The public is impatient with Congress for its nonaction in

this field and I hope that an increased sensitivity on the part of the Members of Congress may lead to early enactment of more progressive legislation in this field. It is long overdue.

#### MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules I call up House Res. 432 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed one hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Government Operations, the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the usual 30 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN], pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 432 provides for consideration of H.R. 5171, a bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The resolution provides an open rule with 1 hour of general debate.

The provisions of H.R. 5171 stem from a report of the Comptroller General and the continuing concern that a full dollars worth of efficient, responsive Government be obtained for every tax dollar. In a report submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, the Comptroller General emphasized the need for centralized management as a means of obtaining maximum utilization and economical acquisition of electronic data processing equipment, which is costly but highly useful.

Savings the Comptroller General authoritatively estimates as substantially in excess of \$100 million a year can be realized through effective and efficient centralized management of the automatic data processing equipment. H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of House Resolution 432.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes to us by unanimous vote of the Committee on Government Operations of the House and is for the purpose of authorizing the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill actually results in the saving of money, which is rather unusual in this day and age. This rule which passed by unanimous vote of the committee brings the bill before us at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to take this opportunity to say that this morning I had the unusual privilege and one which I consider a very high honor, to be permitted to participate in bringing to the floor of this House a rule sponsored by a U.S. Federal judge, my distinguished colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], who has been named by the President to become a U.S. district judge. His nomination has been confirmed unanimously by action of the U.S. Senate.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY] has served with great distinction and great honor as a member of the Committee on Rules of the House. He is a man we do not like to lose from the Rules Committee of the House. We have found him to be always fair in his judgment. He is a man of great ability and of good nature. We have not always agreed across the table as to what should be done and what action should be taken in the Rules Committee on every matter that has come before it. But any disagreement that has come has been in an agreeable manner.

I am sure I speak for the minority members of the Rules Committee, and I am certain for all minority members of the House itself, when we pay our respects this morning and give honor to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], who is soon to leave us to become a U.S. district judge. We wish him well and many years of happiness on the bench, where I am sure he will render the same splendid service to his country that he has rendered to the House as a member of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ROBERTS].

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I would like to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from Ohio in paying tribute to one of the leaders in the House of Representatives, the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. THORNBERRY], who is going back to his first love, the field of law. Certainly I would feel that his going back to bar is a gain for that profession and a distinct loss to the House.



Mr. Speaker, I wish to begin my remarks with an expression of deep gratitude to you personally for your splendid cooperation in making possible the project I am about to describe. And, in expressing that appreciation I am confident you will join me in thanking Dr. George W. Calver, the official physician to Congress and Mr. George Stewart, Architect for our Nation's Capitol, for their valuable assistance. Without such generous support the project would not be possible. And, without it, other and less effective means would have to be sought to bring to the attention of legislators and the public a subject most important to the health of our Nation. My colleagues from Alabama have also given the effort every possible support. So, to all of them, Dr. Calver, Mr. Stewart, and you personally, Mr. Speaker, my sincerest thanks.

These remarks, of course, make it obvious, Mr. Speaker, that you are fully aware of the project of which I speak. And I appreciate this opportunity to inform the other Members of this distinguished body about it and urge them to lend it their fullest support and cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, something new will make a temporary appearance on Capitol Hill next Monday, July 22. And, while it will remain here only a week, I trust it will help write a permanent chapter in the already proud history of the health of our people.

This something new is a mobile unit created to detect emphysema in human beings.

The unit was designed and developed jointly by the Alabama Tuberculosis Association, the public health service and welfare agencies, the Alabama Medical Center, and 31 county TB associations in Alabama.

Of course, as a native Alabamian, and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health and Safety I have watched the development of this unit with exceptional interest and its trial use with excusable pride.

However, there are millions of people in this country—indeed, some of them may be in this very room—who are, by now, asking "What in the world is emphysema?" Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence and the indulgence of those who do know what emphysema is while I briefly describe it. For, believe me, ignorance about emphysema is not to be considered a sign of stupidity.

The word is almost as strange in today's vocabulary as was tuberculosis 75 years ago. This, in itself, is odd because emphysema was known to our forefathers. Not, however, as it affected them. Rather it was how it affected their chief source of transportation and power—the horse. A common vexation of the day was to apparently be cheated in the purchase of a seemingly healthy animal which proved to be wind broken. Upon the slightest exertion the horse became helpless and useless.

Only in our own time has it been realized that a similar condition is widespread among men. All over the world men in increasing numbers are falling into the most frightening of all dis-

abilities—the inability to breathe. And that is emphysema. But, you may ask, is not there more to it than that? How do you explain it?

Well, "emphysema" is the Greek word for "elasticity." As a disease it may be defined as the enlargement of the whole or a part of the lung due to loss of the lung's inherent stretch—or elasticity. Normally the lungs are very much like elastic balloons inside the hollow cavity of the chest. An individual inhales simply by expanding his chest. The lungs expand to fill up the extra space and thereby draw in air. Breathing out is accomplished by relaxing the muscles of the chest. The air is forced out of the lungs, not by the pressure of the chest wall but by the elastic recoil of every part of the lungs themselves. The patient with emphysema is still able to inhale normally, although perhaps with some effort. However, when he exhales, the air is not forced out as completely as it should be due to the loss of stretch. It must be pushed out by compressing the chest through muscular force. This is difficult and inefficient, as can be demonstrated by trying to squeeze the air out of a plastic bag with a small opening.

Emphysema usually begins in the middle or even early adult years. Its course is relentlessly progressive in the absence of treatment. And, there is no known treatment that will put the stretch back into the lungs once it is lost—any more, for instance, than can stretch be put back into a rubberband. One of the earliest symptoms of the disease is wheezing when exerting any effort. But, here is the insidious part of the ailment. This wheezing is sometimes interpreted as a sign of asthma—or heart trouble—and accepted treatment for either of these conditions meets with no success. As the disease progresses and more lung tissue becomes involved the symptoms become more severe and are brought on by less and less exertion. And, the final stage is the development of respiratory acidosis, right heart failure—and death.

Now, the logical questions at this point of my discussion are: "What is the cause of emphysema?" and "What are the possibilities for treatment?"

As for the cause, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to report that no one really knows. Many possibilities suggest themselves, of course, such as—air pollution, gasoline engine exhausts, smoking, allergies, and others.

With regard to possibilities for treatment I have the optimism to predict, Mr. Speaker, that these are unlimited. For, while treatment at the present time is very primitive by modern standards it is still possible to do much more for emphysema victims than could be done 75 years ago for tuberculosis victims when the campaign against that disease was begun.

These two answers, Mr. Speaker, because of their inconclusive nature, bring me to the main point of this discussion. It is vital to the future health of our Nation that further research be done into the causes, early detection, and treatment of emphysema. This will require the fullest cooperation and sup-

port of every citizen. And we, in the Congress, have it within our power to lead the way.

Starting next Monday morning and remaining all week the mobile unit designed to detect emphysema in its early stage will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. Going through it to determine whether one has emphysema takes only a few minutes of well spent time.

Of course, Mr. Speaker, there will, no doubt, be some who say that a Congressman could not possibly have emphysema since he's so long-winded anyway.

But seriously, Mr. Speaker, I invite you and my colleagues to visit the emphysema mobile unit some time next week—the earlier the better.

The device in itself is a milestone in medical research. From it strides of unknown length can be made, the least of which will be the adding of many fruitful and productive years to the lives of millions who now are not even aware that an insidious killer may slowly be sapping their strength. Even in its early stage emphysema can seriously impair the ability to work and take much of the joy out of living.

So, I urge every Member of Congress to visit the mobile unit next week. To repeat—it will be parked on the House side of the east front of the Capitol. It will require only a few minutes for the actual test and the few minutes each of us spend in it will be well worth our time personally and will set a fine example for everyone to follow in future years. I might add that the reports on the tests will be forwarded to Dr. Calver or whomsoever you designate to receive them. They will be personal records, not to be made a matter of public record.

#### CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

#### [Roll No. 99]

Abernethy	Grabowski	Philbin
Ashbrook	Gray	Pillion
Belcher	Hagen, Calif.	Pirnie
Blatnik	Hawkins	Powell
Bolton,	Healey	Rhodes, Ariz.
Frances P.	Hemphill	Riehlman
Bonner	Hoffman	Roosevelt
Buckley	Jarman	Rostenkowski
Byrnes, Wis.	Johnson, Calif.	Roybal
Celler	Jones, Ala.	St. Onge
Clancy	Keith	Schwengel
Clausen,	Kilburn	Scott
Don H.	Landrum	Senner
Clawson, Del	Latta	Shelley
Conte	Leggett	Sheppard
Daddario	Lesinski	Smith, Va.
Dague	Long, La.	Staebler
Davis, Tenn.	McCulloch	Stephens
Diggs	Martin, Mass.	Taft
Donohue	Mathias	Teague, Tex.
Edmondson	Miller, N.Y.	Thompson, La.
Forrester	Morrison	Thompson, N.J.
Frelinghuysen	Moss	Trimble
Garmatz	Nelsen	Ullman
Gialmo	O'Brien, Ill.	Wharton
Gill	O'Brien, N.Y.	White
Goodell	Pepper	

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 350 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

**MAKING IN ORDER THE CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5171, USE OF DATA PROCESSING EQUIPMENT BY FEDERAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES**

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR, AD HOC SUBCOMMITTEE ON RESEARCH DATA PROCESSING AND INFORMATION RETRIEVAL CENTER

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Research Data Processing and Information Retrieval Center of the Committee on Education and Labor may be permitted to sit during general debate this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on Government Operations for bringing out this measure which covers a very important part of our budget, a part which is going to become increasingly costly. We are talking about an item now that probably runs over \$500 million a year. A decade ago probably there was nothing in the budget in this area, or very little. This amount can mushroom under proper and efficient development to where the bill of the Federal Government is \$1 billion. If there is any way in which at this relatively early stage of the game we can produce some efficiencies in the method of procuring this automatic data processing equipment, it behooves us to do so. The big areas, of course, of utilization are Defense, Space, and Atomic Energy. Incidentally, the Joint Economic Committee on which I serve became aware of this problem coming in through the area of our concern for economic statistics, which is an important purpose of these data processing machines, but very definitely those agencies compiling these data are minor users in comparison with the other governmental agencies.

The only other point I would like to make on the rule itself, and again expressing my commendation to both of these committees for bringing this matter to the floor of the House is to call attention to a very important aspect: Whether or not we are going to have the money to buy or to lease the additional data processing equipment we need, because we are talking again, I want to point out, in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars. We certainly will have these funds if we will do what is being done in the private sector of our economy. This is something of a harsh thing. These are the kinds of machines that are removing thousands of jobs.

The efficiency that one obtains in the private sector from the use of these machines is due to the fact that the payrolls are reduced. I have seen little evidence of any understanding of this point on the part of the executive branch of the Government that the savings have to be reflected in cuts in personnel.

Fortunately I am able to end on a happy note. If we will only look at this business of automation we will realize it creates more jobs than it displaces, but the newly created jobs are frequently 100 or 1,000 miles away from where the jobs that have been made obsolete exist. They are frequently, and in fact usually, in different fields of endeavor and under different jurisdictions of the unions who have carved out in the past their particular areas of jurisdiction. Hence a very difficult human, political, and social problem arises in adjusting in this amazing era of automation. The Federal Government must start dealing in terms of economic efficiencies if we are going to be able to pay for these gains in efficiency.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the people handling the bill on the floor a question or two about the discretionary authority. I turn to page 2 of the bill under the proviso that begins on line 17 which reads as follows:

*Provided, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security.*

May I ask the gentleman from Texas or the gentleman from New Jersey this question: Who makes this decision as to whether or not an exception is warranted which is essential to defense or security? Who makes that decision under the legislation as reported?

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, may I answer the distinguished gentleman from Michigan who has done such an effective job in military matters in the great Committee on Appropriations? His question is, as I understand, who would make the decision when something is essential to defense or security that some other agency would lease, purchase, buy, or otherwise utilize a given data computer?

Mr. FORD. That is correct.

Mr. BROOKS. Under this legislation it would be the Administrator of the GSA, when sufficient evidence is presented to him that a delegation of authority is justified for security or defense or for efficiency or economy. It is expected that a decision would be forthcoming promptly from the Administrator. In the discussions with the GSA and the Comptroller General there was no question about the simple justification of a large number of scientific and technical data computers that would obviously be for unique defense and security purposes, and which were really be-

yond the ken of the average computer expert and can justifiably be classified as specialized equipment. This is in keeping with the purpose of this legislation.

Mr. FORD. I can see considerable merit to the overall desire of those who want to achieve greater efficiency and economy in the utilization of this very expensive equipment. On the other hand, there are areas where automatic data processing systems are highly specialized for a specific program and which could not be adapted to broad utilization. Some such equipment is set up for intelligence evaluation, and for a number of other highly classified operations. I should certainly hope that the Administrator of General Services would understand such unique circumstances and would not preempt the utilization of this kind of equipment for various nonrelated jobs.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORD. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the expression of hope of the gentleman, but I remind him that the language of the bill, and even the answer of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], are unequivocally that the power and the control and the discretion are vested in the Administrator of GSA. And there is not any explanation that is going to obviate that plain intent and meaning of the law.

Mr. FORD. The only answer I can see, and I have read some of the testimony before the committee, is that the final authority would rest in the Executive Office of the President. In this case I suspect that would be the Director of the Bureau of the Budget. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. BROOKS. Of course, the Administrator of FSA is appointed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget works with him on any such decision. I think without question anybody would understand that it would be, as the gentleman has explained, quite essential and obvious that certain of the installations in this country would be used on a part-time basis. This in itself should not indicate that they are not being utilized as fully as circumstances demand.

As the gentleman from Michigan has indicated, certainly nobody would attempt to say that this is a waste of money. It might be totally standby equipment vital to certain agencies.

Mr. FORD. On page 26 of the hearings there appears a statement that the Comptroller General suggests there ought to be a minimum of exemptions passed on by the Administrator. I do not want more exemptions than are necessary, but I do not want to hamstring the Department of Defense, the CIA, or any other agency that is involved with defense or security just because the head of the GSA wants to use an iron fist on this matter. So I hope from the comments of the gentleman from Texas and others some guidelines may be given to the head of the GSA so that he understands the needs and the problems of these most important agencies.



Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KLUCZYNSKI].

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

A RECORD OF GREAT ACCOMPLISHMENT AND  
LOYALTY

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express to you and to every Member of the House, sentiments which are particularly close to your heart, Mr. Speaker, and are shared by every Member of the House of Representatives.

I refer to and call attention to the fact that on July 18 of this year Eugene T. (Gene) Kinnaly will have completed 45 years of service as secretary and administrative assistant to two distinguished Members of this body, and particularly that he has served as the first assistant and good right hand to our beloved Speaker since 1928, when Speaker McCORMACK first arrived in Washington, as Congressman representing the 12th Massachusetts District.

Forty-five years of continuous and loyal service to his country, his Congressman, to all Members of this House and the citizens of the 12th Massachusetts District is an outstanding and unique record and contribution of which every man who greatly admires him, rejoice with us in spirit that Gene continues to serve. I am sure he will as long as he is physically able.

Today's testimonial merely marks the passage of time in a long life of great usefulness to his fellow man. We are happy to know it will continue indefinitely.

Those of us who have known Gene Kinnaly intimately, have always been impressed with his loyalty to his chief, the thoroughness and reliability he constantly demonstrates in every task he undertakes, and in striking manner the warm and friendly personality, which he shares with everyone who calls at the Speaker's office.

Every one from the most humble to the most prominent, is immediately struck by his sincerity, his desire to help everyone, and the easy, quiet, and efficient manner in which he accomplishes every responsibility.

Gene Kinnaly probably knows more about how to get things done properly through Federal departments and agencies, has developed through the years probably more friends in these departments than any congressional staff member. He is undoubtedly better and more favorably known to Members of this body than any other person serving in a similar capacity.

I know I am speaking for hundreds of Members and former Members of this House when in their behalf I offer our warmest congratulations for the splendid service Gene has rendered to us all, our most sincere best wishes and hopes that he will continue in his present duties for the Speaker for many years to come, and how pleased we all are to count him as a valued friend.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the following gentlemen may extend their remarks in the RECORD at this point—the gentleman from Oklahoma, the distinguished majority leader [Mr. ALBERT], the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BOLAND], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MURPHY], and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join the gentleman from Illinois in this word of tribute to a great American, my friend, Eugene Kinnaly. After 45 years on Capitol Hill, there is little about its operations, past or present, or its history, that is unknown to Eugene Kinnaly. He has served as our great Speaker's right-hand man for 35 years, and for 10 years before that he served as assistant to the late Honorable James Gallivan, of Massachusetts. The fund of knowledge he has acquired over more than four decades has made him an indispensable aid to the Speaker and a great servant of the House. Gene has a stupendous acquaintance with everything that has to do with the House of Representatives, ranging from parliamentary procedure to personnel. He is also a fine lawyer and a fine gentleman.

The House of Representatives has undergone some drastic changes during the momentous years Gene has been here. As its duties became heavier, its responsibilities more wide ranging and complex, Gene has continued to learn, to sharpen his talents, and to dispense his skilled services unstintingly to his own Members, to other Members of Congress, and to staff and committee employees.

Forty-five years is only the beginning in the career of a man of Gene's energy and ability.

He is one of the institutions of the House. I hope we may have the benefit of his talents for many years to come.

I wish him health and happiness and many more years of satisfaction in doing the work I know he loves.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with this tribute that is being paid here today to a grand person, Gene Kinnaly. During the many years I have known him, no one could have been more accommodating and helpful to me than he has been. We all realize the importance of good staff work, especially in these days when the Congress is facing increasingly heavy responsibilities to the country.

Certainly Gene Kinnaly has proved his worth to the Speaker and to all of us who have occasion, from time to time, to call on him for information.

His long record of service represents a career of outstanding loyalty and dedication to the Congress. I congratulate him and wish him many more useful and happy years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join those of my colleagues paying tribute to one of the

most remarkable public servants in the history of this Congress, Eugene T. Kinnaly.

Gene completes 45 years of congressional service today, which makes him the dean of the present staff here on Capitol Hill and which must be very close to an alltime record of service to the House of Representatives.

My own administrative assistant, James N. Milne, recently completed 38 years of service with me, a long and wonderful association; but Speaker McCORMACK's assistant surpasses our record. Gene Kinnaly today completes 35 years with the Speaker, but he preceded the Speaker to Washington with his prior service to Congressman James Gallivan.

I wish for Gene and the Speaker many more years of good health and great service to the Congress and to the people of our country.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I find it gratifying that the Members of this House are taking the time to give this public recognition to one of its most able and likable employees, Eugene T. Kinnaly. I am personally pleased to join with my colleagues in this unusual tribute.

His long service of 35 years with our beloved Speaker, after earlier service with the late Representative James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, has brought him to the favorable attention of almost every Member of the House and has gained for him their high respect. His gracious response to every request for assistance is a characteristic of his gentlemanly nature.

It has been my pleasure to have known Gene Kinnaly for many years. I fervently hope that, now having completed 45 years of honorable and effective service, he will choose to remain with us for years to come and that during those years he will have the blessing of good health and everything he desires. I heartily congratulate him today.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, I consider it an honor to pay tribute to a devoted public servant and our good friend, Eugene T. Kinnaly. His tireless work in the House of Representatives has continued for 45 years. The citizens of Massachusetts are proud to call him a native son.

Gene Kinnaly has been a part of the Congress of the United States through the administrations of eight Presidents. He has served this House through 20-some Congresses. He arrived here to work as secretary to the late Congressman James A. Gallivan, of Massachusetts, with whom he was associated for 10 years. In the 35 years since then, he has been the confidant and administrative assistant to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN W. McCORMACK, our present Speaker of the House.

We are reminded of the remarkable record of Gene Kinnaly in length of service, but we cannot forget the more remarkable part of that record, which embraces the enduring character of his accomplishments. He meets each day, each person, and each task with friendliness, unhurried assurance, and open

honesty. Few are endowed with his spirit of helpfulness.

Pressures do not bring a distraught atmosphere to Mr. Kinnaly's being. Many have praised him for his courteous disposition and the retentive memory that works best when under pressure.

His knowledge of the intricate network of government makes him a valued assistant. His diplomacy is exemplary. His calm disposition is a joy.

Gene has always been devoted to his job, but not in a narrow sense which excludes the bigness of the problems to be met. Members of Congress have sought his advice and always carry away a lasting impression of a warm and true friend. He understands the workings of a democracy.

It is with genuine pride that I extend to Eugene Kinnaly my congratulations and wish for him many years of continued success. We are glad to have him in our midst.

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there are few occasions, I think, that have given me greater pleasure or more satisfaction than this particular one. Mr. Eugene Kinnaly, the distinguished gentleman to whom I am about to pay tribute, has been with us in this great House for 45 years on this day. For 35 of those years, he has been the able and devoted right hand of the man who is now our Speaker, the honorable and distinguished Representative from Massachusetts, JOHN McCORMACK.

Gene Kinnaly, as he is so well known to most of us, has served our House and our Speaker for nearly half a century with a devotion and a vitality that have made him a credit to both. I am sure that my colleagues will take it as no slight when I say that I know of few in these chambers who are held in higher esteem by all than Gene Kinnaly.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege and an honor of the highest order for me to join in the plaudits of my fellow Representatives today and pay tribute to a gentleman who has served this House so well for so long. With our recognition, I want him to know that he has gained the highest regard and respect of the Members of the House, and we all hope he will be with us at least 45 more years.

Mr. BATES. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Capitol Hill, as a secretary, 23 years ago, I knew the employees much better than I know the Members of Congress. These were my first friends and my longest and the memories of them I deeply cherish. It was from the actions of these people that I recognized the truth and significance of that old phrase, "the power behind the throne."

There was John Andrews, of Salem, Mass., later to become the Clerk of the House of Representatives. John's desire to serve was too great for the stamina required and more than his body could endure.

There was Ivan Hedin, secretary to our former colleague, Dick Wigglesworth, of Massachusetts, and who was rich in wit and service, and whom we sorely miss around these Halls.

There was Jimmy Milne, until recently secretary to our beloved former Speaker,

JOE MARTIN, of Massachusetts, and who helped Joe in his long years as Republican leader.

Massachusetts has another son, for years a close friend of the triumvirate from Massachusetts referred to above. I refer, of course, to Gene Kinnaly, for 45 years a secretary on Capitol Hill and for many years assistant to our esteemed Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Gene is a quiet man but ever ready with a gentle smile and kind word. My association with him is something I always will treasure. He is a deeply religious man and oftentimes I note, at noon-time, that he and his friend, Jim Guinea of Congressman KLUCZYNSKI's staff, wind their way to St. Peter's Church near the Capitol for a few moments of meditation.

Gene has long been one of the most effective behind-the-scenes worker I have ever known. I am sure that his counsel, experience and judgment have been invaluable to our Speaker in the many trying problems of his office.

He is all of this and more but most important of all to me is that I am privileged to call him my friend.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I am most pleased to join my colleagues in commending the longtime, invaluable aid of our distinguished Speaker, Eugene T. Kinnaly, who is completing 45 years of outstanding and devoted service on Capitol Hill.

Always friendly, helpful, considerate of others, he enjoys the high esteem and affection of Members of the House, his fellow staff members, and all who know him.

In expressing my great pride in the tremendous, memorable record which Gene Kinnaly has accomplished as a congressional secretary and administrative assistant, I take great pleasure in extending to him and his family my heartiest congratulations with my good wishes for many more happy anniversaries and choicest blessings for many more years of success, happiness, and accomplishment.

As secretary to the late, colorful, and highly esteemed Congressman James A. Gallivan, Gene Kinnaly came to Washington as a young man to carve out an enviable career of effective and devoted service to his district, State, and Nation.

Ten years quickly sped by and then began Gene Kinnaly's long, illustrious career as administrative aid to our distinguished and beloved Speaker, JOHN W. McCORMACK, taking on new and most important tasks and duties through all the vicissitudes and changing currents of national politics and world events.

As aid to the Speaker, he stands at the very top of his great profession, making invaluable contributions to the Congress and to the Nation. Capable, loyal, completely devoted to his job, Gene Kinnaly is a skilled professional who has gained tremendous knowledge of Federal affairs, a sure, competent grasp of affairs in his district and the country, a flair for getting things done easily and quickly that stamp him as one of the most outstanding in his field.

All of us in Congress who have come to know Gene Kinnaly are aware of the

great contributions he has made during the many years of his service on Capitol Hill. He has won a legion of friends in and out of public life and enjoys the respect and esteem of his associates, the constituency he serves, a wide range of public officials, employees of the House of every rank and station, and people in all walks of life who have come to know him and who cherish his friendship.

I rejoice with the many friends of this able, zealous, and dedicated worker on this happy occasion and join with very many officials, associates, and people in wishing for Gene Kinnaly all the blessings and graces of good health, success, and happiness that the good Lord may bestow.

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, it is a particular personal pleasure for me to join with my colleagues in this special tribute to Mr. Eugene T. Kinnaly, administrative assistant to our beloved Speaker, who is today beginning his 46th year of congressional service.

"Gene," as he is affectionately known to all of us, personifies the highest tradition and ideal of an exemplary congressional assistant. He is supremely capable, intensely loyal, and devotedly patriotic in his service to the country in his congressional assistant capacity.

Despite the tremendous workload that we know is his responsibility, he always has time to guide the newer and lesser experienced secretaries in the discharge of their particular duties, and he has given counseling words of wisdom to untold Members here whenever called upon.

Gene's superior and developed talents shine through his modest personality, and his kindly nature and disposition are a byword on Capitol Hill.

Here is a man who has dedicated himself to patriotic service for his country for 45 years, and there are few indeed who can match his unique and inspiring record.

We are happy to salute you today, Gene, and join in our most earnest wishes that the good Lord will keep you with us, in continuing good health, for many more years of your fruitful work.

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my few words to the many that are being paid in sincere tribute today to Gene Kinnaly on the 45th anniversary of his service to the Congress of the United States.

Gene has an unrivaled record, I believe, as a congressional secretary. Those of us from Massachusetts, of course, are proud that many of his years on the Hill have been spent as the chief aid to our esteemed Speaker of the House.

I know that I speak not only for myself, but for literally hundreds of Members of Congress and staff assistants when I say on this significant occasion "thanks, Gene," for the many times you have given freely of your good counsel and effective talents.

Men of such character and devotion to public service are rare and the Congress, indeed the Nation, is indebted to Eugene Kinnaly.

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, the wealth that man accumulates is not



in the gold that is mined from the earth, but in the gold that is in the friendships engendered by his words of gentleness and sympathetic understanding, his deeds of helpfulness, his spirit of humility and humanness. By this measure Gene Kinnaly is one of the richest men on Capitol Hill.

In the 45 years he has been a part of the life of the House he has made new friends every day and never lost an old one. I join with my colleagues in a salute of admiration, affection, congratulations, and good wishes to Gene Kinnaly.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure and privilege for me to offer my most sincere and heartfelt congratulations to your administrative assistant, Eugene T. Kinnaly, upon the completion of his 45th year of service here in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Gene has long been a very dear friend of mine. A tireless worker and an outstanding administrator, Gene Kinnaly is also a very warm and understanding person whose close friendship and timely advice I deeply value. Knowing him is one of the pleasant experiences you enjoy here in Washington.

I can only hope and fervently pray that God will continue to shower His blessings on Gene and that happiness and good fortune will follow him all the days of his life.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the service of Eugene T. Kinnaly.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER].

Mr. HECHLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was consulted as to the advisability of this legislation and whether that agency was asked for its opinion.

Mr. BROOKS. The answer to the gentleman's question would be that they have not been. However, the Comptroller General of the United States who is the chief accounting officer of the Congress investigated this complex problem with reference to all of the Government agencies, including the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. So, while it has not been directly consulted, the ADP utilization problems and practices of that agency were taken into consideration by the Comptroller General of the United States and were reflected in the recommendations contained in his March 6, 1963, report.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HECHLER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. As I understand the question of the gentleman from West Virginia, he asked whether this matter went to the space agency?

Mr. HECHLER. That is correct. I am merely interested in whether the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was given the chance to express its views on the pending legislation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The witness for the space agency testified before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and he expressed his views in response to a direct question on this matter and was in total opposition to this type of approach.

Mr. HECHLER. I thank the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 5171, with Mr. ASHLEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] is recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALL-HAUSER] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this measure which was unanimously approved by the Committee on Government Operations on June 19, 1963, and reported to the House on the same day, has a direct and specific purpose. The enactment of this measure will provide the necessary organization and authority for effective, centralized and coordinated acquisition and utilization of costly automatic data processing equipment on a Government-wide basis.

Mr. Chairman, according to authoritative evaluations of the Comptroller General, the centralized management as provided for in H.R. 5171 will result in sound, accountable and direct savings substantially in excess of \$100 million a year. The Comptroller General in his report and in his testimony before the committee states that these savings can be realized through centralized, coordinated management which, in turn, will

make possible, first, higher utilization of equipment now on hand and, second, more economical acquisition of equipment in the future.

Mr. Chairman, efficient and economic utilization of this costly equipment requires that it be used on a maximum round-the-clock, three-shift basis. Equipment now used by the Government is utilized only a little more than one shift a day, on an average.

Mr. Chairman, enactment of this bill will almost immediately result in an increase in utilization and, therefore, result almost immediately in substantial savings to the taxpayers.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 5171 will also make it possible to develop an economical Government-wide acquisition program. At this time, today about 85 percent of this equipment is leased. The Comptroller General has indicated in the most recent of a series of audit reports submitted to Congress on March 6, 1963, and in testimony before the committee that there are significant benefits to the Government in the selective purchase of many automatic data processing systems and components.

The Administrator of the General Services Administration would carry out this centralized management program which is comparable in many respects to other property management and centralized procurement responsibilities previously delegated to him by the Congress. Agencies would state their automatic data processing requirements to him and make payments to a revolving fund created under this bill. With the funds so deposited the Administrator would then either purchase or rent necessary equipment to fulfill individual agency needs.

Mr. Chairman, among the amendments adopted by the committee is one which would include automatic along with electronic equipment. Also the program was amended to cover equipment used for and at the expense of the Government in the execution of contracts and other agreements. These amendments were recommended by the Comptroller General.

The committee also added provisions for an annual report to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress relating to expenditures from the GSA-administered revolving fund created under this bill.

Mr. Chairman, there is without any doubt, based upon the extended reports made by the Comptroller General, who is the chief accounting officer of this legislative body, that hundreds of millions of dollars can and should be saved if we pass this bill. The Comptroller General stated without equivocation that we could save \$148 million in the first 5 years of this program and \$100 million each year thereafter. I asked him if this was a sound statement. He said without equivocation, that he thought it was a very conservative estimate of savings that could be achieved through the passage of this legislation.

The March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General is the latest comprehensive evaluation of Government automatic data processing utilization submitted to

Congress. It is not the first, however. His recommendations for centralized management of automatic data processing equipment go back to 1958 when he originally made a general recommendation of this kind. Following 2 years of inaction by the executive branch, he reiterated his recommendations in stronger terms in 1960. Following 3 further years during which there was no significant improvement, he restated his recommendations in March of this year. This March 6, 1963, report is one of the strongest and most forceful reports the Comptroller General has ever issued concerning a problem so simply and obviously subject to solution. According to the authoritative figures contained in the Comptroller General's report, and his testimony, the taxpayers of this country are losing approximately \$10 million every month a centralized, coordinated program applicable to all Government agencies is delayed in implementation. It is essential that Congress act swiftly and decisively to provide the administrative machinery by which these significant sums can be saved.

Under provisions of H.R. 5171, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to provide central management of Government automatic data processing equipment. The General Services Administration, which is under the direction of the Administrator, is an operating agency of the executive branch especially created by Congress to perform centralized procurement and property management functions. H.R. 5171, which is an amendment to title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, therefore constitutes a logical extension of duties comparable to those which this agency performs.

Under this centralized management program, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations can also be greatly improved. The Comptroller General has predicted an ever increasing rate of growth in the use of this equipment in Government. He has suggested:

We are discussing here a fixed charge on the Government. This is very much like the fixed charge on the debt. What we are seeing here is growing into what \* \* \* will be a major fixed charge which cannot be reduced and which will probably grow and properly so if we are going to control what goes on in the Government.

Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963, and it is estimated that this figure will increase to 1,600 by the end of 1964. Furthermore, the Comptroller General testified that use of automatic data processing equipment in Government will increase more in geometric rather than arithmetic progression and that he does not expect that utilization will reach a plateau in the near future. At this time, budgetary appropriation requests for hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for such equipment are scattered throughout the Federal budget, making it difficult for Congress and the Executive Office of the President to maintain effective budgetary

control. Following approval of H.R. 5171, comprehensive information from one source will be available to the Bureau of the Budget, to the substantive committees of Congress, to the Appropriations Committees, and to the Committees on Government Operations, as well as to the Comptroller General. The utilization of this information will assure both the executive and the legislative branches of proper policy and fiscal control over this ever increasing expenditure of taxpayers' funds.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 5171, which has been explained to you, in general, by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks]. It seems to me that we have an obligation to the people we represent not only to refuse to appropriate money for projects that we do not consider to be in the public interest but also to attempt to save some money. This bill gives us one grand opportunity to do just that.

The title of the bill really is the key to the whole program, and I would like to read it to you, because it sums up in one sentence the purpose and why we should all support it:

A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies.

This is not a new proposal. The General Accounting Office has been making studies and recommendations since 1958. On March 6, 1963, it made a very strong recommendation that a centralized purchasing and management agency should be set up. The General Services Administration is exactly this.

Under the act of 1949, on the recommendation of the Hoover Commission and by act of Congress, it was designed to procure and manage real and personal property. It seems to me this falls within that category. We have the statement of the Administrator that no huge staff will be added. He claimed he had sufficient technicians in his own department and could utilize technicians from other agencies now employed by them and, with the help of representatives of private industry, he could come up with the answers required for the various agencies without adding a great deal to the staff. Individual studies would have to be made to determine if it would be financially advantageous to the Government to purchase or to continue to lease if no purchases were made. Even if we continued as we are the utilization of the equipment we now have on a 24-hour basis, or as nearly to that as possible, it would be a big step forward and, as the gentleman from Texas emphasized, studies made on about half of the present equipment indicated a substantial saving of \$140 million would be made in the first 5 years of its operation and more than \$100 million a year after that.

Most of the equipment used by the agencies is general-purpose equipment,

something like a typewriter or adding machine. It should be set up in such a manner that any other agency can come in and utilize the equipment the same as any other recording apparatus.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, this bill has great merit.

I would like to say the Comptroller General in his studies has emphasized the need for it, but up until now no definite program has come out of these recommendations. He regarded them as essential.

If you will read the March 6, 1963, report by him, it would seem quite evident that we should pass this type of legislation.

I would like to close by reading one answer to a question. During the hearings the Comptroller General was asked the following question:

Mr. Campbell, in light of this, do you feel that these poor utilization conditions, including the question of lease versus purchase, could be improved by having the kind of central coordination that is provided in this bill, H.R. 5171?

Mr. Campbell, the Comptroller General of the General Accounting Office, an arm of the Congress, responded in this way:

We are convinced of it. We hope that this will be done. This is one of the most serious problems the Government is facing in this area.

Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that this measure will be supported and that this very worthy bill will be passed unanimously. I would hope that the Members give it careful consideration, because, as I said at the outset, we do have an obligation to attempt to save money in the operations of the Government as well as in not appropriating that for which there is no need.

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. HORTON. I would like to rise in support of this bill and to commend the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER], and other members of this committee, for bringing this bill to the attention of the House. I think we should be very aware of any efforts that this House can exert to effect substantial savings in the operation of Government. This seems to me to be one of those areas in which we can be most effective. Therefore I rise in support of the bill and commend the committee for the work it has done in this respect.

Mr. Chairman, the bill, H.R. 5171, now before us has my full support. I believe its passage will reflect the interest in this body of maintaining effective and efficient management over the utilization of automatic data processing equipment by the Federal Government. Further, a direct consequence of this improved managerial function will be a substantial saving of taxpayer funds.

This bill vests authority in the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation,



and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies. The centralized management provided by this bill is authoritatively estimated by the Comptroller General of the United States as realizing a saving substantially in excess of \$100 million a year.

Just as private industry has made increasing use of automatic data processing systems in recent years, so has the Federal Government benefited from the advantages these systems possess. Use of automatic data processing systems in Government has increased from 414 in 1959 to 1,169 in 1963. It is estimated that by the end of fiscal year 1964, approximately 1,600 systems will be in use.

The Comptroller General has reported that 85 percent of these systems are leased without comprehensive evaluation as to the benefits to the taxpayers which might be gained through purchase. As no statutory requirement now exists to maintain effective budgetary control over the hundreds of millions of dollars spent each year by Federal agencies and other users for the equipment, legislative review and control of Government automatic data processing operations obviously suffers.

Another problem inherent in the present absence of centralized management is that Government agencies are not fully utilizing automatic data processing equipment at this time. An inventory report of the Bureau of the Budget made in August of 1962 reveals numerous examples of extremely low use of this equipment. Central coordination, as provided by the instant bill, can almost immediately begin to achieve savings by increasing the utilization of automatic data processing equipment the Government now has on hand.

It is noteworthy that the Administrator of General Services has testified the coordinated program provided by H.R. 5171 should not require a large increase in his agency's management staff. Additionally, implementation of this program is expected to result in a lessening of personnel requirements of user agencies.

For the economy and efficiency which would result from this measure, I urge its favorable consideration.

I also commend my colleagues on the Government Operations Committee for the excellence of their work in preparing this bill and reporting it to the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNYDER. I was just curious as to the definition of "data processing equipment." What does it constitute?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. It includes more than electronic equipment. It includes equipment other than electronic equipment.

Mr. SNYDER. It does not get into the office electric typewriters, and things of that nature, does it?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. No, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Yes, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I am one of those who served on the committee at the time the General Services Administration Act was enacted, which goes back to 1949. I followed with a great deal of interest during the years the progress of this agency. I would like to ask the gentleman if he in his opinion feels that the projected savings that this proposal will make are really genuine or not.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. I firmly believe they are genuine, yes.

Mr. HARVEY of Indiana. I thank the gentleman very much.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 8 minutes.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Chairman, the bill we are considering today offers us an opportunity to gain more effective control over an area of Federal expenditure that is already quite significant and becoming more so every day.

There are nearly 1,200 different automatic data processing systems in use in the Government this year and there will be 1,600 by the end of 1964. The annual cost to the Government of renting and purchasing this equipment runs well into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Decisions as to the type of equipment to be acquired, the manner of acquisition, the degree of utilization, and the time and nature of disposition are now made, for the most part, by the individual using agencies. There is a minimum of coordination among them.

The Comptroller General of the United States conducted a study of this growing problem, and, as a result, expressed the belief to the committee that substantial savings would be possible if these decisions were made, from the standpoint of the needs of the Government as a whole, by a centralized management agency, rather than by the individual using agencies.

The Comptroller General informed the committee that by purchasing more of this equipment rather than leasing it, for instance, the Government could effect potential savings in excess of \$148 million over the next 5 years, with possible savings of \$100 million a year after that. He also indicated that additional savings could be made by more effective utilization of this equipment within the Government once it has been acquired.

In other words, there is a pressing need for more effective Government-wide coordination of the acquisition and utilization of this equipment. The committee concurs in the belief that this can best be accomplished by centralized control of these functions, and that is precisely what this bill will accomplish.

There is one aspect of this proposal that will bear careful watching in the

future. That is the impact of this bill on the tactical and classified operations of the Defense Establishment. The committee determined, and I think wisely so, that the fewer the exceptions to GSA's authority the better. But the committee does recognize the problem that could arise by removing control of equipment that is an integral part of a vital defense system from the Secretary of Defense and placing it in an outside agency. The bill does not except the Defense Department specifically, but it authorizes the Administrator of GSA to delegate his authority when such action would be essential to defense or security.

I think it is reasonable to assume that any irreconcilable conflict between Defense and GSA over the control of the former's use of automatic data processing equipment would be resolved adequately at higher levels. Nevertheless, I do want to point this potential problem area out to my colleagues as one that will bear careful watching.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN].

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of this Subcommittee on Government Activities, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], for his courtesy in extending me this time to speak in opposition to this bill. It is with regret I must take this position, for I have the highest regard for my dear friend from Texas.

I am against H.R. 5171 for the reason that though its intention is the best intention, it is too sweeping and would tend to retard the development of a growing and developing science. That is what computers are. This is not a case of adding machines, or typewriters, but this is a growing science that has not been standardized at all. To place a lid on it in the form of an agency that is not associated, let us say, with the specific duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration is, in effect, taking the very duties of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and transferring them to the General Services Administration. That is how sweeping, I think, this legislation is.

This bill would authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by or at the expense of the Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment. Some of the Members of Congress are very familiar with this legislation and some are not.

Therefore, I shall furnish a little background. We are talking about electronic data processing systems which frequently are referred to as giant brains, robots, monsters, or just plain computers. We are talking as well about conventional punched-card machines. The main emphasis, however, is on the larger gear; that is, on the electronic data processing systems. You may have heard them re-

ferred to as Univac's, Ramic's, Edvac's, Maniac's, Lark's, Stretch'es, 7090's, 301's, and a host of other names and numbers assigned by the manufacturers.

The Bureau of the Census was the first Federal Government agency to use one of these systems for a business-type application. That was in 1951. This has grown, however, to where in 1963 there were 1,248 such systems in use in the Federal Government with a total cost annually of \$704 million. The range of the rental cost of one of these systems per month is from \$1,000 to over \$100,000. The purchase price range is from \$25,000 to \$7 million and up.

At one time all of the systems could be purchased or rented except IBM. Presently and for the past several years IBM systems also can be purchased or rented. The purchase-option method can be used in all cases.

The argument is and has been: Is it more economical to purchase or to rent these electronic data processing systems? This is what the Brooks bill is all about. In an effort to solve the purchase versus rental problem, it would centralize in GSA the control of the procurement and utilization of electronic data processing systems throughout Federal Government.

I am opposed to the bill and would like to take a few minutes to tell you why. I am hopeful that my remarks will adequately describe the shortcomings of the bill and that for these reasons you will join in opposing it. As you know, the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee's Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics, of which I am chairman and of which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] was chairman in the 87th Congress, has some jurisdiction in the electronic data processing equipment field in the Federal Government. We have carried out our responsibilities diligently. We have had hearings on this subject for a total of 5 days. Consequently, I believe that we are in a fair position to know what should be done and what should not be done in regard to electronic data processing systems.

At the outset, I should like to point out to you that I do not object to the intention of the bill, but I do object to the basic elements of the bill and its sweeping misassignment of responsibilities. The bill authorizes the General Services Administration, in effect, to run the electronic data processing activities of the Federal Government, a job the General Services Administration cannot do. The bill simply overruns and overkills the electronic data processing problem and could easily make matters worse instead of better. There are problems enough with the experts throughout Government trying to manage electronic data processing, and I cannot see how one service agency could do it.

Let me get down to specifics. H.R. 5171 is intended to take action on the recommendations made in the March 6, 1963, report of the Comptroller General of the United States to the Congress titled "Study of Financial Advantages of Purchasing Over Leasing of Electronic Data Processing Equipment in the Federal Government." The report indi-

cated that the Federal Government potentially could save \$148 million over a 5-year period if it were to purchase rather than lease more of its electronic data processing equipment. The report estimated an additional annual savings of \$100 million if the machines were used more than 5 years.

The Comptroller General recommended also the means of accomplishing the savings. I quote from the letter to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives which accompanied his report:

We believe that, to fully realize savings of such magnitude, basic changes in the Government's overall management system will be necessary. Decisions as to the financial advantages of purchasing will have to be made from the standpoint of the Government as a whole, and not primarily from the standpoint of individual using agencies as has been the practice in the past. In addition, more attention needs to be given to obtaining more complete utilization of the equipment acquired. We believe that the only practicable way in which the kind of coordinated management can be practiced to achieve the possible financial savings cited is through the establishment of a small, highly placed central management office in the executive branch of the Government. Accordingly, we are recommending to the President of the United States that he establish such an office in his organization.

I supported the Comptroller General's recommendation in my remarks on the floor of the House on March 18, 1963.

Now, on the other hand, the report of the House Committee on Government Operations—No. 428—states, and I quote:

H.R. 5171 provides the centralized management that the Comptroller General recommends.

I want to assure you that it does not.

Page 3 of the report goes on to say:

This authority would be exercised under the overall authority of the Executive Office of the President and the Bureau of the Budget in the exercise of traditional budgetary and policy control.

In my opinion, this is a complete dilution of what the Comptroller General had in mind.

Still, strangely enough, General Campbell favors the Brooks bill, but he seems to consider it as assigning only house-keeping functions to GSA and still wants the policy guidance in an office in the President's organization. This is covered in General Campbell's testimony before our subcommittee. General Campbell, in his enthusiasm to save money, and each of us wants to do that, somehow overlooks the sweeping provisions of the bill which go far beyond house-keeping functions. This is the great danger in this bill. Some seem to think that it provides for a few essential functions, whereas in actuality the bill gives sweeping authority to the GSA.

For my part, based upon the facts, I submit to the Congress that the Comptroller General's recommendation of a central management office in the President's organization and the Brooks bill, which places the authority in GSA, are two different things. Not only are they different per se, but they are different as a matter of practical application.

A central management office in the President's organization would be in a position to carry out the functions that the Comptroller General has in mind. The President's office is the place to make decisions which affect departments and agencies across the Federal Government. I think you will agree with me that it is too inconceivable to think of the Administrator of the General Services Administration telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science not presently capable of standardization. Each executive agency has a different problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

It is quite likely that the proponents of the Brooks bill would tell you that the Administrator of GSA would not attempt to tell General Day, for example, about automating the Post Office Department, but I want to point out to you that such authority for the GSA Administrator is specified in the bill where it gives him the control of the utilization of electronic data processing systems.

Similarly, I am certain that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], in his bill, does not intend that GSA take over the operation of all of the electronic data processing systems in the Federal Government. Still, H.R. 5171 states that the Administrator of GSA is authorized and directed, among other things, and I quote:

To operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, our Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics has held five hearings during the course of the last month on the subject of the use of electronic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. You will recall also the hearings the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. HENDERSON] held on the subject in October 1962. After listening to the testimony in these hearings, I can report to you that there is a lot more to the electronic data processing problem than the Brooks bill covers. Mind you, I am not saying that utilization and acquisition of electronic data processing systems are unimportant, but I am saying that the Brooks bill goes about the task in the wrong way and deals with only one of the many problems involved. This is what we have faced in the electronic data processing area time and again. Someone seizes upon a problem here and seizes upon a problem there and never considers the whole picture. The Brooks bill is a case in point. It deals only with the computer hardware. People in the industry are becoming more and more aware that we have been overconcentrating on computer hardware and that we should start paying some attention to the people who make it go. According to figures supplied by the Department of Defense, for example, we



spend just as much money for the personal services in computer work as we do for the machinery.

So, when and if we legislate on the electronic data processing problem, we want to consider the human element, the standardization of this equipment, and improved management in general and not just selected areas.

Some of the other subjects that should be included in action taken on electronic data processing are: A study of pricing to find out why certain relationships exist between purchasing and leasing, improved progress in the use of automatic programming languages, attention to assignment of full responsibility for electronic data processing matters in departments and agencies, attention to the level at which the electronic data processing activity is placed in the agency's organizational framework, the establishment of indexes for telling us what we are saving by using electronic data processing, and improvement in general of the reporting and statistics relating to electronic data processing equipment.

In opposing the Brooks bill and in asking you to join me in this opposition, I do not mean to ask you to oppose something with nothing. At the next meeting of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee which is to be held on August 1, as chairman of the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee, I will have a proposal to present for the committee's approval. I can tell you now that at this point in time we do not see the need for legislation. This does not mean that eventually some legislation will not be required, but at the present time we see the need for a high-level Presidential appointed group—including Members of Congress, Federal executive agencies, industry, and general public—to place all of these matters under study and to report back to the President and to Congress with their findings. We have already been in touch with representatives of the Budget Bureau concerning this proposal, and I have been informed that Special Projects Funds of the President's Office are available for this study. At our August 1 meeting I plan to present for full committee approval a draft of a letter which our chairman—and I hope—with the support of the full committee will send to President Kennedy. I can assure you that these electronic data processing problems require advice and counsel of unquestioned competence and authority—the very best brains that this country can bring to what is now called the electronic revolution.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will agree with me that it is unreasonable to think of the Administrator of General Services telling the Secretary of Defense, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and others how they can or cannot operate their departments. Automatic and electronic data processing is a rapidly growing science, not presently capable of standardization. Each executive agency has a different

problem and develops a different computer for that different problem.

I submit that we should have a longer study of this problem before we impose any restrictions or limitations on the development of this wonderful new science.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Washington [Mr. STINSON] a member of the committee.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to point out to the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. OLSEN] that the purpose of this bill is economy and efficiency and to save the American taxpayers some money. There is no intention in the bill to retard the growth of science in the particular field of data processing equipment.

The Federal Government is not involved to any great extent in the development of data-processing equipment. The more sophisticated equipment that was referred to by the gentleman from Montana could be easily exempted under this bill, as provided on the bottom of page 2. So I do not think the advance of science in this field is going to be hampered in any respect if we enact this legislation. The end result is that we are going to save a large quantity of money. If there is a special instance involved, a particular piece of equipment can be provided for the agency concerned.

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. Would the gentleman be in favor of the General Services Administration operating the equipment for the Defense Department and the Space Agency?

Mr. STINSON. Did I understand correctly that the gentleman asked if the GSA should operate the equipment?

Mr. GARY. Yes. The bill says so. That is the objection I have to the bill. It says it shall control and operate the equipment. How about operating equipment designed for the Defense Department for specific purposes of defense?

Mr. STINSON. The legislative intent is not to accomplish that purpose but merely to coordinate the operations of the various pieces of equipment that are scattered throughout the Government and to get full utilization of the equipment.

Mr. GARY. If that is made plain in the bill, I would have no objection to it personally, but I would have to oppose it otherwise.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I will say to the gentleman it is not plain in the bill. It cannot be made plain without rewriting the bill.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have requested this time in order to give to the membership of this Committee the benefit of such special knowledge of this question as I have gained by virtue of my activity on the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

A few weeks ago the chairman of my subcommittee, the gentleman from West Virginia, the Honorable KEN HECHLER, referred to me for my attention a certain report to the Congress of the United States by the Comptroller General.

This report had been sent to the chairman of my committee by the Comptroller General by a letter of transmittal dated June 11, 1963, and went to considerable length to point out that in the opinion of the General Accounting Office, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had, during a period of over 2 years, made overpayments in excess of a million dollars for rentals on automatic data processing equipment.

In fulfillment of the request of my subcommittee chairman to look into this matter, I conferred for the better part of an afternoon with Mr. D. T. Spaulding, president of the Federal Systems Division of the International Business Machines Corp., and another officer of his company, during which time he was kind enough to acquaint me with the nature of the problem and many of the difficulties involved in an accurate determination of the problem of automatic data processing rental charges.

A few days after our conference, I received a letter from Mr. Spaulding stating that although there were no adequate records in existence upon which to make an accurate assessment in the matter, the IBM Corp. had nevertheless agreed to adjust the matter by paying the sum of \$1,100,000 to the Government.

My discussion of the problem with Mr. Spaulding very soon led me to the conclusion that the matter was far more complex than it seems when it first meets the eye. In the first place, you heard the word "system" used during the discussion on the floor today in the talk about automatic data processing equipment. "System" is really the word for it. I do not have time to go into this fully, but I want to make a slight stab at drawing a parallel.

Let us say we have the mission of giving photographic coverage to a series of events here in Washington. We order movie cameras, flashbulbs, tripods, all sorts of film, miniature cameras, press cameras, many types of lenses, and accessory equipment of various kinds and description.

If we had a particular mission to fulfill, let us say to photograph a parade, we might decide we needed a movie camera but no floodlights and no flashbulbs, a tripod to hold the camera steady and a telephoto lens. We would put those things together and we would have brought into existence a particular camera system which would appropriately serve our mission of photographing a parade.

Every agency of the Government has its own particular mission to perform. To perform that mission they need not only many different kinds of automatic data processing equipment—they need to put together widely variant automatic data processing systems, composed of various combinations of the components that go to make up such systems.

Examples of such components are computers, memory units, power units,

multiplexers, and tape drives, many of which are identical. Also there are card punches and card readers, not to mention such items as consoles and magnetic tape.

I serve on the Committee on Astronautics which has to do with NASA and that is why I have come in contact with this problem. But, NASA has no monopoly in this field and neither does any agency. An IBM official was quite frank to say that his company is constantly encountering new problems with reference to the leasing and selling of this equipment to private industry. It is virgin territory. There is much ground that has not been covered, and such difficulties are no reflection upon anyone. But there is a pressing and urgent need for some agency in Government to develop specialized knowledge in this field, and to bring about economic use of these machines. Great waste is possible and I daresay great waste is going on in every department that uses this automatic data processing equipment. I think this bill will enable one agency to develop a competence that will enable it to decide what system may be necessary to perform a given job. The taxpayers stand to benefit greatly by such an arrangement.

I want to ask the chairman of this subcommittee one question. Is it your view that this bill, as now drawn, would enable the General Accounting Office to ride herd upon the mission of any agency in Government?

Mr. BROOKS. May I say in reply to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Georgia, that certainly the General Accounting Office as the accounting arm of this Congress has the authority to investigate any agency of Government.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Let me restate the question. I really did not mean the General Accounting Office, I meant the GSA, the General Services Administration. Is it the opinion of the chairman of this subcommittee that this bill would grant the General Services Administration the power to ride herd on NASA?

Mr. BROOKS. No, not in any way. Actually, to be quite candid about it, the bill would provide the authority to have the General Services Administration act as purchasing agent for the various agencies on the basis of the needs of those agencies and their requirements for these automatic data processing machines, and they would buy the equipment and supply the equipment.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Eighty-three Members are present, not a quorum. The Clerk will call the roll.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 100]

Abernethy	Bonner	Clark
Ashbrook	Broomfield	Clausen,
Auchincloss	Buckley	Don H.
Bass	Byrnes, Wis.	Cawson, Del
Belcher	Clancy	Conte

Daddario	Johnson, Calif.	Rooney
Dague	Jones, Ala.	Roosevelt
Derwinski	Kilburn	Rostenkowski
Diggs	Knox	Roybal
Donohue	Landrum	St. Onge
Edmondson	Latta	Schwengel
Evins	Leggett	Scott
Farbstein	Lesinski	Shelley
Foreman	Long, La.	Sheppard
Forrester	Mailhard	Shipley
Gialmo	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Calif.
Gibbons	Mathias	Staebler
Gonzalez	Miller, N.Y.	Stephens
Grabowski	Morris	Taft
Gray	Morrison	Teague, Calif.
Griffin	Mosher	Teague, Tex.
Hagen, Calif.	Moss	Thompson, La.
Hansen	Nelsen	Thompson, N.J.
Harding	O'Brien, Ill.	Trimble
Harsha	Philbin	Utt
Healey	Pillion	Wharton
Hemphill	Powell	White
Hoffman	Rains	

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies, and finding itself without a quorum, he had directed the roll to be called, when 350 Members responded to their names, a quorum, and he submitted herewith the names of the absentees to be spread upon the Journal.

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, as ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on Census and Government Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

It is never my intention to be disrespectful of either the prerogatives or the performance of any other committee.

In this instant matter, however, I must be very blunt.

In terms of both legislative procedure and the content of this bill, we have a situation reminiscent on two counts of the patent medicine salesman at the carnival.

Procedurally, we have his "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic.

One single day's hearing was held by the Government Operations Subcommittee on this bill. Two witnesses were heard—the Comptroller General of the United States and the Administrator of General Services Administration. I should point out that the latter was very much a party of interest, since his agency would acquire the enormous power delegated in this bill.

What is even more to the point and even more shocking in this "hurry, hurry, hurry" tactic is that not a single one of the Government agencies nor any representative of private industry who are principal users and suppliers of automatic data processing equipment—including enormously complex and sophisticated automatic data processing systems—was called or heard.

Now the bill comes to the floor of the House under a 1-hour rule.

Furthermore, no real effort was made to correlate the Government Operations Subcommittee action with the very intensive and extensive hearings conducted by the Census and Statistics Subcommittee. While this latter subcommittee has been carrying on hearings and issuing reports on the broad subject of automatic data processing since the 86th Congress, in recent weeks, since the issuance of the Comptroller General's March 6, 1963, report, it has been focusing attention on questions of lease versus purchase and questions of strengthened Government-wide policy for acquisition and utilization of this equipment. This latter series of hearings was completed only Monday of this week, and the report now is in preparation. Yet, for all practical purposes, the Government Operations Subcommittee has acted as if this subcommittee and its labors had never existed. I know as a matter of fact that it has not even seen the transcripts of hearings in which these matters were fully discussed.

I think it goes considerably beyond any question of jurisdiction to suggest that the Census and Statistics Subcommittee may have some information and judgments in this matter worthy of the consideration of this House. I think it is obvious that this consideration cannot possibly be given under the limitation of time and the cavalier treatment of this complex and costly matter involved in these "Hurry, hurry, hurry" tactics.

I said at the outset that this was reminiscent of the carnival medicine man on two counts. I come now to the second point.

There is not the slightest evidence, either in the 1-day hearings or the committee report of the Government Operations Subcommittee, that the nostrum they are peddling will really cure the ailment.

On the contrary, there are good reasons for believing that it will aggravate rather than alleviate the condition.

Let us take a close look at the patent medicine we are being asked to buy on a "hurry, hurry, hurry" basis.

Let me point out first of all the enormous grant of power which this bill delegates to General Services Administration.

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

The committee report comments, apropos of written objections generously incorporated in the committee's printed hearings, from various agencies, but otherwise totally ignored:

Opposition to H.R. 5171 may center upon a misinterpretation as to the extent of the Administrator's authority.

I see no basis for misinterpretation of the language I read. It is a total grant of authority. Indeed the addition in committee of the words, "or at the expense of" means that GSA authority would extend to automatic data processing equipment in the hands of private contractors doing Government business.



Now let us consider this enormous grant of power in the light of two or three facts:

Under existing laws and regulations GSA already has authority to process Federal supply schedule contracts for lease of ADP equipment. This means it does the routine work necessary to implement equipment requirements of the respective agencies. What has been the GSA record on this score? I read from the June, 1962, report of the Comptroller General:

In the past, several months have elapsed between the expiration of 1 year's schedule contracts for the rental of electronic automatic data processing equipment and award of the next year's contract. During these months, no contract terms were in effect. When the new contracts were awarded, the terms were made retroactive to the effective date. These time lapses have caused difficulties such as, (1) unnecessary administrative expense for GSA and the agencies using the contracts and (2) problems in the areas of budgeting, purchasing, paying, and maintaining machine utilization records in the agencies using the contracts.

I am informed that such delay cost one important supplier \$500,000.

This is the record of GSA in handling the paperwork. I submit that it does not recommend transfer of vastly broader, substantive authority to GSA.

Consider another aspect of the matter. During the 1-day hearing conducted by the Government Operations Subcommittee, Mr. Boutin, the GSA Administrator, was asked by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD] this pertinent question:

Do you have in GSA at the present time personnel who are capable of analyzing these tremendously difficult machines and these difficult processes and the varying needs of this department or that department?

Mr. Boutin replied:

We do have substantial in-house capability right now \* \* \* how many additional people would be required, I could not tell you. It would be minimal.

The facts are that Mr. Boutin further testified that GSA now has 481 persons in the agency for its own automatic data processing operations. Let me say right now that this agency which is going to save the Government millions of dollars by purchasing these computers has never purchased one itself. In fact, the 10 computers it has on hand at the present time are all leased. To suggest that the vast functions involved in exercise of the Government-wide control of automatic data processing called for in this bill would involve only a minimal increase in GSA personnel is too preposterous to even argue. Either this bill means nothing, or Mr. Boutin fails to comprehend the responsibility he would acquire, or he was something less than frank with the committee.

One further point. The Comptroller General, in recommending "overall policy guidance and direction" of automatic data processing, proposed that it be directed from the Office of the President.

This led to the following colloquy between Mr. Boutin and the chairman of

the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BROOKS], as follows:

Mr. BOUTIN. We have a close and everyday liaison with the President and his Office.

Mr. BROOKS. You do not think he would be reluctant to call you and say, "Bernie, we have got to get together on this now." You would be there.

Mr. BOUTIN. It is not unusual to have the telephone ring and have the voice come on and say, "This is the President" and go right into what he has in mind. He is not bashful.

Time does not permit further comment on this exchange.

The heart of this issue goes to the distinction between overall policy guidance—which, I may say, under the prodings of the Census and Statistics Subcommittee, the Comptroller General, and the Bureau of the Budget, is presently being provided and constantly improved—and actual planning, acquisition, and operation of this equipment by a central agency.

Remember we are talking not just about simple punchcard machines. We are talking about complex automatic data processing systems used by the Atomic Energy Commission, by the Department of Defense for defense against nuclear attack, and also by NASA.

With this fact in mind, it seems to me obvious that the views of departments and agencies responsible for scientific and technical use of this equipment are not only highly relevant but absolutely essential. It seems to me that their views need to be explored in depth and not handled in the perfunctory fashion of routine letters introduced into the appendix of the hearings record. Evidently, the Government Operations Subcommittee does not share this view.

The Census Subcommittee does hold this view, however, and I include a few excerpts of testimony which have been given before the subcommittee.

One statement was made on June 24 by Mr. John P. Abbadessa, the Controller of the Atomic Energy Commission:

Implementation of a program should rest with the agency that has responsibility for the program. In the AEC, a large percentage of our computer work is done in the scientific area. These are very complicated machines and complex applications. We cannot conceive that a central group elsewhere in the Government could discharge this responsibility efficiently.

As to control of contractors by such a central group he added that he felt it would result in administrative costs that could outweigh any economies that would be gained.

On July 15 in response to my questioning on the proposal incorporated in this bill, Mr. John D. Young, the Director of Administration for NASA, voiced his emphatic opposition. He said that he believed the effect would be to diffuse responsibility and accountability. He urged further clarification of guidelines by the Budget Bureau, and continuation of the work that GAO is doing.

And then Mr. Young added this significant comment:

I think that if tight control were given to the GSA or to the Bureau of the Budget in terms of our use of computers, there is a

real question, in fact there would be no question that we could not meet flight schedules at the rate that we are trying to meet flight schedules today.

Here are just a few more comments taken from testimony by department and agency representatives before the Census and Statistics Subcommittee.

Mr. Harold Seidman, Acting Assistant Director, Office of Management and Organization, Bureau of the Budget:

I would strongly object to any arrangement whereby the control of automatic data processing equipment was put in some agency other than the one responsible for its operations.

Mr. A. T. Bishop, staff director, Data Systems Division, Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense:

We are aware of certain proposals which would greatly centralize control over the acquisition, management, utilization, maintenance and operation of all automatic data processing equipment in the Federal Government. Performance of these responsibilities is a prerequisite to effective control over operating Defense programs. The Department opposes such proposals which would vest these responsibilities in another agency and interfere with vital command relationships.

Mr. O. Glenn Stahl, Director, Bureau of Programs and Standards, Civil Service Commission:

In view of the very size and complexity of Government operations, I personally would tend to shy away from any heavy emphasis on centralization of such processes.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe my record in this House will justify any suspicion that I am hostile to economy or that I favor bureaucratic proliferation, expansionism, or empire building.

We are getting a fast sell on this bill on the alleged grounds that it will prevent waste and improve efficiency of automatic data processing operations.

I think we had better take a second look. I think we need to remember we are dealing with something a little more complex than procurement of paper clips.

Otherwise, we may find to our sorrow that we are compounding instead of curing the evils which concern us all.

There is an old warning about rushing in where angels fear to tread.

I think that warning is appropriate this afternoon. Again, I urge defeat of H.R. 5171.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I want to say to the gentleman that I agree completely with the position taken by the gentleman. And, is it not a fact that the General Services Administration will have complete control over the operation of these machines and the purchase of these machines, whatever department is involved?

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is precisely what the bill says, and there cannot be anything else under this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. And further than that, the General Services Administration charges 10 percent commission on everything they purchase for any other agency. They then take that money,

put it into their own fund and spend it at will without asking Congress. So, to that degree you have back-door spending in this bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. There is a great deal involved from the financing angle in this bill that needs to see the light of day before we vote on it.

Mr. JENSEN. And, if the gentleman will yield further, to my memory every time in the past any agency asks to reorganize and buy such machinery, they say it will save personnel. However, the record shows that the very next year they ask for more people.

Mr. JOHANSEN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ALGER. Will the gentleman tell us how many departments of Government are opposed to the bill? I have found some here, but I am wondering if the gentleman would list them for us.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I can tell the gentleman from Texas from my own knowledge that these include the Department of Defense, the Post Office Department, the Atomic Energy Commission, and NASA, among others. I know about that many.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORHEAD].

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, and also to commend its author, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas has a nose like a bloodhound for searching out waste and inefficiency in Government. And when he finds waste he expresses himself in a salty way which does not always endear him to the bureaucrats who are more interested in preserving their particular petty empires than they are in rendering service to the taxpayers at the least cost.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] is a member of a subcommittee, the members of which, on both sides of the aisle, are dedicated to the proposition that it is sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of service for each dollar of tax he pays. You or I might disagree about whether the Federal Government should embark upon a particular new program, but we can all agree that any program which the Government does carry on should be carried out as efficiently as humanly possible. We can all agree to support a savings of dollars which does not reduce any essential Government service. That is the purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is an economy vote. But it does not involve any philosophical concept other than the concept of efficiency in Government. This bill represents a \$100-million-a-year savings. As soon as this program becomes fully effective it will mean a savings of \$100 million per year.

Mr. Chairman, I have said that I thought it was sinful if the taxpayer does not receive a dollar's worth of Govern-

ment service for every dollar's worth of tax he pays. If this expensive equipment is not used on a three-shift basis, the taxpayer does not receive 100 cents on his dollar. But what are the facts? Twenty-four percent of this equipment is used only on a two-shift basis. The taxpayer is getting only 67 cents worth of Government out of each dollar of taxes. But even worse than that, 70 percent of this equipment is only used on a one-shift basis, one-third of the time which it should economically be used. Therefore the taxpayer is getting only 33 cents worth of services out of his tax dollar.

Mr. Chairman, I think this is a sinful waste of the taxpayer's money, and I believe that H.R. 5171 should be enacted in order to eliminate this sin.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCLORY].

Mr. McCLORY. Mr. Chairman, it was suggested a few moments ago that this was a hurry, hurry, hurry bill. The investigation in regard to electronic data processing equipment in executive agencies was begun back in 1958 and a report was delivered to the Congress in 1960. I carry here to the well of the House with me four reports that we have received on the Government Operations Committee from the General Accounting Office with respect to the use of this equipment by executive agencies for the purposes of effecting savings. I would not be standing here, you can believe me, Mr. Chairman, if I did not firmly believe that this would effect savings of not less than \$100 million.

Are we going to concede that private industry can have electronic data processing centers and utilize these machines full time, but the Federal Government is not capable of that action? That is essentially what we are deciding here today. Certainly, the individual agencies do not want to surrender the control they have over this equipment, the spending of the money which goes into automatic data processing equipment and the employees who operate it. But is that efficiency? Efficiency means for us to provide the maximum for the dollar paid by the taxpayers, and the maximum use of this equipment by the fewest number of employees.

GAO made one investigation in the Chicago area with regard to the distribution of VA checks. When they put in the electronic data processing equipment they consolidated six regional offices. Now they have one office instead of six. What else happened? They lost 76 employees. That is too bad. But this example shows how coordinating use of automatic data processing equipment can result in an efficient operation, and that is what we are trying to accomplish here today.

I do not know how long we must study these problems in order to come up with an answer, but it seems to me that 3, 4, or 5 years ought to be enough. We have received reports from the General Accounting Office which we have had an opportunity to study and read. Thereafter, the General Accounting Office

recommendations have been put in the form of a bill which we have here today and which we should be able to act on and we should act favorably on this bill.

Another objection has been made to certain language in this bill with regard to delegating authority. That is an essential part of the bill and should remain. If the GSA were not permitted to delegate authority to the Department of Defense with respect to its own specific automatic data processing equipment, we would be shortchanging the Department of Defense. Also, we have provided that GSA may operate such equipment just as all the other agencies can operate it. The GSA may operate such equipment for itself or for other agencies. These are the essential parts of the bill.

Now, these are essentially the objections that have been cited. The committee has considered all of these objections, and we adopted this bill as a full committee. We are now recommending the bill to the Congress for enactment for the purpose of saving not less than \$100 million.

We should be interested in that. Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman if he is not aware that GSA is already operating some 10 units of its own and this allocation of authority to operate is on a Government-wide basis, not with respect only to GSA?

Mr. McCLORY. This is in a proviso which applies to GSA. There would not be any harm in GSA operating the equipment, if it could do it, for other agencies of the Government.

The Space Agency uses electronic data processing equipment. The use of ADP equipment by all Federal agencies was investigated and reported to the Congress in 1960.

According to that report the Department of Defense had most of these machines or systems. They had 626 out of 1,006. Now that total has gone up to 1,200 systems, as they say. But there is no reason why the Department of Defense cannot keep theirs. That is why the authority is given in the bill to delegate to the Department of Defense and all other agencies to lease, purchase, maintain, and operate automatic data processing equipment. This is essential under a clear interpretation of the bill.

This is a good bill, and it should be passed.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCLORY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does this saving of \$100 million presuppose the use of this equipment by the various centers working on a round-the-clock basis?

Mr. McCLORY. On a much fuller basis. That is the recommendation of GAO. If we are not going to accept the recommendation of GAO to effect savings, then we better find some other agency to look to. This amount of \$100 million is the figure given us by GAO.



Mr. GROSS. The gentleman has not come close to answering my question.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DULSKI].

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 5171.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Postal Operations, House Post Office and Civil Service Committee, I am intensely interested in anything that affects the Post Office Department. It appears to me that this bill, giving authority to the Administrator of the General Services Administration over automatic data processing equipment, places authority outside of the Post Office Department to make decisions about and to generally interfere with postal operations. I could not possibly agree with such an arrangement.

I should like to read a letter dated May 9, 1963, to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget from Frederick C. Belen, Acting Postmaster General, in which Mr. Belen comments on H.R. 5171.

OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER GENERAL,  
Washington, D.C., May 9, 1963.

Hon. KERMIT GORDON,  
Director, Bureau of the Budget,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GORDON: This is in reply to the request of the Assistant Director, Legislative Reference, for the views of this Department with respect to H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

The Post Office Department does not favor the establishment of a central control organization for the procurement or management of electronic data processing equipment for all Federal agencies.

The use of electronic data processing equipment is vital to the day-to-day conduct of the Post Office Department business and is considered to be an essential administrative sanction of the Department.

While the bill would permit the Administrator of General Services Administration, in his discretion, to delegate the control of electronic data processing equipment in certain cases, we believe that because an exceptionally high degree of responsiveness to the data processing needs of the Department is required, it is imperative that all phases of administrative management of the equipment, personnel, job schedules, and contact with vendors remain under the direct control of the Postmaster General or his designated representative.

This Department is currently participating in the experimental regional sharing plan for electronic computers sponsored by the Bureau of the Budget. The Department intends to continue in this effort in order to help secure maximum utilization of data processing equipment. However, it is not considered advisable to relinquish authority over the management of this function since data processing services are fundamental responsibilities of the Postmaster General.

This Department would not be opposed to the establishment of an electronic data processing fund provided such fund is available for the purchase of electronic data processing equipment if an economic evaluation of the relative costs of lease against purchase indicates that it is to the best advantages of the Government to purchase equipment and further, that the fund is available to support extraordinary one-time

expenses for data processing services which may from time to time occur.

Sincerely yours,

FREDERICK C. BELEN,  
Acting Postmaster General.

I fully support Mr. Belen's remarks and I daresay this bill would have a similar unfavorable effect on most of the executive departments and independent agencies. Letters of the type of Mr. Belen's from the various departments and agencies bear me out on this.

Mr. Chairman, we would do great damage to the automatic data processing program of the Federal Government by passing this bill. H.R. 5171 certainly should not pass the House.

Mr. WALLHAUSER. Mr. Chairman, I have no more requests for time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished member of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY].

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply concerned about this bill. As most of you probably know, the Treasury Department has been a leader in the use of electronic data processing equipment. As chairman of the subcommittee that handles the appropriations for the Treasury Department and the Post Office Department, I have been working on the problem of data processing equipment for a long, long time.

By the use of data processing equipment in the Treasury Department we have saved millions of dollars; and I mean literally millions of dollars. Without the use of electronic equipment in the Post Office Department the vastly increased volume of mail could not be handled today. About 2 years ago we gave to the Bureau of the Budget, whose appropriations are also handled by our subcommittee, \$50,000 to study the very questions covered by this bill.

Frankly, I am thoroughly in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, but I think it goes too far. I think we need a central agency to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of this equipment, because as it is now, with each department making its own contracts with the manufacturers, they cannot secure as favorable contracts as a central agency could negotiate.

But this bill says, and I read:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate—

That is all right—

and control—

What?—

the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

Now, to give the General Services Administration the right to use and operate this equipment in the Department of Defense, in the Atomic Energy Commission, in NASA, in the Treasury Department, in my judgment is absolutely all wrong. What do they know about operating this machinery in the Defense Department? Instead of saving money

they would have to have technicians who are familiar with the technical aspects of every department of the Government.

This machinery is scattered all over the United States. We are not dealing with just a few machines here in the city of Washington. They are broadly scattered. Right now the Internal Revenue Service is establishing data processing machinery in their seven regional centers for processing income tax returns. They requested nine but our subcommittee recommended reducing the number to seven, which will save several million dollars. This equipment will be set up in each of those seven regions. Now, is the General Services Administration going to have people in each of those regions to control the operation of that machinery? If so, they will have to employ numerous technicians. If the words "control" and "use" and "operate" are stricken from the bill I will vote for it. I think we need some central agency to coordinate the purchase, leasing, and maintenance. But unless some amendment is adopted to strike out the control, use, and operation by the General Services Administration I shall be compelled to vote against it. I think it is fantastic to talk about giving the General Services Administration control over the use of this machinery in the Department of Defense or in the Central Intelligence Agency, and other sensitive agencies of the Government.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. FASCELL].

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, I think my distinguished colleague who just preceded me made an eloquent case for the legislation. There is very little I can add to that case except to say this: that the question of central purchasing and the question of standardization has been a problem which has plagued all levels of the government starting with the municipality, to the Federal Government.

When you get to a budget the size of the one which we must consider here, the problem of central purchasing and standardization is so gigantic as to shake your imagination.

In our Committee on Government Operations we have been dealing with this problem, as have other committees of this body, for a considerable time. I forget the exact number of items used by the Federal Government, but as I recall it is over 3 million. The problem of standardization is so complex that by the time you standardize you have so many new items of inflow into the pipeline that you cannot keep up with the standardization.

In an effort to save money, everyone is in agreement on the desirability and necessity of central purchasing. True, these machines are not of the same category as screwdrivers, yet it has been admitted here that you can within the limit of a single agency make more efficient and more economical use of these machines by proper programing and otherwise. It makes good business sense to adopt these practices within the agency itself. Why is it not good busi-

ness, good sense, and good logic to do so on a Government-wide basis where applicable, where necessary, and where feasible? That is what we seek to do with this legislation.

Certainly the equipment suppliers would love to have the competition that exists now among all the agencies of Government. Certainly every agency of Government would like to have the best and the newest of equipment, whatever it is, no matter how little they utilize it in space or time. But this is not economic.

I do not mean by that that we ought to eliminate the right of the agency to have its own requirements. The bill specifically provides that they submit their requirements and the purchasing will be done to meet those requirements. But that does not mean that where practicable and possible, if there is a common use or machines can be put to a common use, the General Services Administration should not have the authority at least to try to make this kind of common-use purchase, this kind of common-use leasing, and this kind of common-use management.

No one anticipates that in cases of special military requirements men are going to be taken out of uniform and civilians from the General Services Administration will be sent down to the various stations and posts to operate the machines. That is not the intent of the legislation.

Therefore, I would submit that the theory of central purchasing which the Hoover Commission tried so hard for so many years to get into Government, and that our own committee has fought for so diligently, should be put into effect. Here is a brand new area, expanding like a mushroom, where the bureaus and agencies themselves, the General Accounting Office and others, have recognized that we must do something now before it gets out of hand, before all of these new systems get into the agencies and are fixed to the point where you will never have the opportunity to achieve standardization or common use. The time is now to get some action on this problem. That is all we seek to do.

I have cosponsored this legislation by my bill H.R. 7559 and I urge the passage of it by this House.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, in considering the various proposals contained in H.R. 5171, it is important that we recognize the significance of placing the coordination and control of all Federal electronic data processing equipment under the General Services Administration. In addition we must recognize the far-ranging effects of this bill on the executive agencies and private industry as well as the projected saving indicated by the General Accounting Office.

The General Services Administration has a difficult time controlling and administering its own internal data proc-

essing system now. Should we burden it further with the task of coordinating the programs of other agencies? It is beyond estimation at this time how large a staff will be required by GSA to administer the program proposed here. Furthermore, the agencies using the equipment would completely lose their prerogative to select the equipment which will best perform a particular job. This is particularly important when the Nation's security is involved as it is in the defense and space efforts.

This bill will also have a detrimental effect on the competitive spirit which is only now developing in the computer industry. Contrary to the point of view of the Comptroller General in the hearings on this bill, it is not always to the best advantage of the Government to purchase automatic data processing equipment, nor is it always wise to use the equipment 24 hours a day. There are many situations in which it will be to our advantage to reexamine the competitive equipment available and select new computer hardware instead of purchasing existing equipment. The Government must examine the feasibility of purchase in each individual case.

The enactment of this legislation would bring about a huge windfall to the company which presently is the largest supplier of systems. This would discourage competition in the industry and lock that company in for an indefinite period of time.

Finally, the legislation would, I think, discourage technological advancements. The purchase of existing equipment would prevent for some time Federal Government participation in the fruits of the imaginative and productive research now carried on by all companies in the computer field.

I must therefore, Mr. Chairman, oppose this measure. It will not bring about in the long run the savings claimed for it and it may instead set back the cause of progress in this vital contemporary industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That title I of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (63 Stat. 377), as amended, is hereby amended by adding a new section to read as follows:*

"Sec. 111. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of electronic data processing equipment by Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment. Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the Administrator through purchase, lease, transfer of equipment from other Federal agencies, or otherwise and the Administrator is authorized and directed to provide by contract or otherwise for the maintenance and repair of such equipment. In carrying out his responsibilities under this section the Administrator is authorized to transfer electronic data processing equip-

ment between Federal agencies, to require joint utilization of such equipment by two or more Federal agencies, and to establish equipment pools and data processing centers for such joint use when necessary for its most efficient and effective utilization: *Provided*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate (1) general classes of equipment, (2) equipment of special design needed to fulfill some unique requirement or special purpose of a particular Federal agency, and (3) equipment necessary for national defense and security.

"There is hereby authorized to be established on the books of the Treasury, an electronic data processing fund, which shall be available without fiscal year limitation for expenses, including personal services, other costs, and the procurement by lease, purchase, transfer, or otherwise of equipment, maintenance and repair of such equipment by contract or otherwise, necessary for the efficient coordination, operation, utilization of such equipment by and for Federal agencies.

"There are authorized to be appropriated to said fund such sums as may be required which, together with the value, as determined by the Administrator, of supplies and equipment from time to time transferred to the Administrator, less any liabilities assumed, shall constitute the capital of the fund: *Provided*, That said fund shall be credited with (1) advances and reimbursements from available appropriations and funds of any agency (including the General Services Administration), organization, or persons utilizing such equipment and services rendered them, at rates determined by the Administrator to approximate the costs thereof met by the fund (including depreciation of equipment, provision for accrued leave, and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges and for amortization of installation costs, but excluding, in the determination of rates prior to the fiscal year 1966, such direct operating expenses as may be directly appropriated for, which expenses may be charged to the fund and covered by advances or reimbursements from such direct appropriations) and (2) refunds or recoveries resulting from operations of the fund, including the net proceeds of disposal of excess or surplus personal property and receipts from carriers and others for loss of or damage to property: *Provided further*, That following the close of each fiscal year any net income, after making provisions for prior year losses, if any, shall be transferred to the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts."

Mr. BROOKS (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and be open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after "Sec. 111." insert "(a)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, so that there may be no misunderstanding about these committee amendments, I should like to explain what they are, and then I intend



to ask that the committee amendments be considered en bloc.

Other than changing subsection designations and other minor typographical changes, the basic changes made by the committee are these.

We changed the word "electronic" to "automatic" to include punchcard and other nonelectronic equipment as well as electronic data processing components in the coverage.

Second, it is made specifically clear in the bill that reports on the funding, with reference to those matters involving the revolving fund, would go to the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress and any excess of funds that is not used would be returned to the Treasury.

The other basic change in the legislation which was included at the suggestion of the Comptroller General is that coverage under the bill would include that equipment which the U.S. Government buys and pays for incident to execution of contracts and agreements.

Mr. Chairman, basically that is what the committee amendments do.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendments be considered en bloc and, following that, I would say to the membership I hope to see an amendment offered, possibly by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia, to remove the word "control" and the word "use" from page 1 of the bill because that has apparently upset many of the people who otherwise are as dedicated as I am to save that \$100 million a year and thereby increase the efficiency of the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, then is my understanding correct that the amendment relating to the deletion of the word "control" and the word "use" is to come later on?

Mr. BROOKS. I understand that such an amendment will be offered and I would be delighted to discuss the amendment at that time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like to direct a question to the gentleman from Texas in regard to his explanation of these amendments.

Do I understand that the individual agencies will have to justify their request under the terms of these amendments on a yearly basis for new equipment? Let us take, for example, the Social Security Administration where we have had a large outlay each year from the social security trust fund for data processing equipment. I think the gentleman from Texas is familiar with the operation we have in Baltimore and the additions at the Baltimore center for the Social Security Administration. This is equipment that has been worked many, many hours and the Bureau of the Budget in their reports and the Comptroller General has found this to be one of the best Government equipment operations in the country. Presently, the Social Security Ad-

ministration has to come in and justify on a yearly basis any new additions to this equipment complex. Does the amendment that you ask to be considered en bloc with the other committee amendments provide that the Social Security Administration will have to come in on a yearly basis and justify in their appropriation requests any additions to this computer equipment?

Mr. BROOKS. I want to thank the gentleman for that question because the answer is, of course, "Yes." Under this bill a given agency if they wanted an additional computer capacity would have to get authorization and appropriations through the appropriate committees of the Congress to cover the cost of the additional ADP capacity required during the fiscal year. With an authorization and an appropriation from the Congress the agency would then put in a request to the GSA for the automatic data computing equipment which would give them the required capacity to meet their needs. So the answer to the gentleman's question is, "Yes, every dollar would be approved by the appropriations committee."

I might add with reference to this revolving fund in the General Services Administration, reports would be made to the Committee on Appropriations. Also, any excess of funds resulting from savings from the operation within the agencies would revert back to the Treasury of the United States on an annual basis.

Mr. LAIRD. The GSA cannot tap the revolving fund unless the individual agency has saved the money in their annual appropriation bill; is that correct?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct. They would be operating under the Committee on Appropriations as they are now.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BROOKS. I would be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. On the bottom of page 2, the committee amendment, in italics, do I understand that this is based on the premise and the presupposition that under this bill the authority to delegate authority will be vested in GSA; is that correct?

Is that the premise of this amendment?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct; on the basis of the justification which is laid out in the succeeding line. Let me see if I can be of some further assistance to my friend, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JOHANSEN].

Line 23 goes on to explain that they could eliminate from the performance of this bill, in the discretion of GSA authority, any individual automatic data processing systems or specific units of equipment when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or for the security or defense of this country.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman a further question: If it is proposed and if it should be voted by this House—and I will oppose the amend-

ment when it is offered to strike out the words "control" and "use"—how can you then preserve to GSA power and authority which has been delegated?

Mr. BROOKS. We would only be changing slightly the delegation—the authority and power—that is authorized in the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. If the gentleman will yield further, what will this power and authority amount to if you are going to eliminate the key words "use" and "control"?

Mr. BROOKS. The gentleman understands that we are trying in this legislation—this is the concept of it—to have the different agencies and the Government to work together in an effort to achieve both efficiency and economy. I think this is a mutual purpose that we all feel. I think the agencies do. I give the people in the bureaus that credit, as I hope they give to me. Even without the words "control" and "use" this bill would give this one agency of the Government, the GSA, the responsibility for coordinating and otherwise providing for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by the Federal departments and agencies. It is not a very complex matter to describe. It means that there will be one agency to buy and lease this equipment at the best possible deal in order to see if the equipment can be made available to all agencies to meet their needs on a reasonable and more economic basis.

This is a recommendation that I did not dream up, but is a recommendation of the Comptroller General of the United States. He, as the gentleman from Michigan knows, is a distinguished Republican appointed some years ago as Comptroller General to a 15-year term, and he has worked on this for some years. This has not been a hasty recommendation.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Do I understand that there is now before the committee a unanimous consent request to consider the amendments en bloc?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 8, after the word "by" add a comma and the following: "or at the expense of."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time to direct some questions to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], the chairman of the subcommittee, as to the meaning

and import of the words in this amendment "or at the expense of."

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, it means "or at the expense of the U.S. Government."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Let me be more specific. I want to be very clear as to what I am driving at. Does not this amendment specifically mean that the powers that are granted in this bill to the GSA will be extended to all contractors in private industry operating on Government contracts?

Mr. BROOKS. If the gentleman will yield, I do not believe that would follow, sir.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I think it is very clear, and I think it was brought out in the hearings, that it was for the specific purpose, and I will ask any of the gentlemen of the committee who are here from the Committee on Census and Statistics if it was not the understanding that it was specifically for the purpose of expanding this authority to cover Government contracts?

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Do I understand by the gentleman's line of questioning that he is opposed to the contractors who use this equipment paying for the use of it?

Mr. JOHANSEN. Of course not. My point is I want to know just what the outer reaches of authority that we are granting to GSA are. I want to know how prodigious a job GSA is going to be doing without any addition or at least with a minimum of addition of personnel. It is my clear recollection in reading the committee report that the purpose of this was to include controls of the acquisition and the use and operation of this type of equipment by non-Government agencies operating under Government contracts.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Electronic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and", and immediately after line 3 insert the following:

"(b) Automatic data processing equipment suitable for efficient and".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 10, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, beginning in line 17, strike out "(1)" and what follows thereafter down through page 2, line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "individual auto-

matic data processing systems or specific units of equipment, when such action is necessary for the economy and efficiency of operations, or when such action is essential to defense or security: *Provided further*, That the Administrator, in his discretion, prior to the beginning of fiscal year 1966, may delegate authority to lease, purchase, maintain, or operate automatic data processing equipment to the various Federal agencies to the extent necessary and desirable to allow for the orderly implementation of this utilization program."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I simply say if we do not grant the kind of total power, czar authority, to the agency that is written into section 111(a), it will not be necessary to start adopting amendments to give part of it back. I directly and particularly emphasize the fact that this amendment does not in any way alter the fact that the discretion rests with the GSA Administrator.

I urge defeat of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the quotation mark at the beginning of the line, insert "(c)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike "Treasury," and insert in lieu thereof "Treasury".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 23, strike the word "electronic" and insert in lieu thereof the word "automatic".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 5, strike the word "agencies," and insert the following: "agencies: *Provided*, That a report of receipts, disbursements, and transfers to miscellaneous receipts, under this authorization shall be made annually in connection with the budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and to the Congress."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, after the quotation marks at the beginning of line 6, insert "(d)".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, strike out "less any liabilities assumed,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 14, strike out "persons" and insert in lieu thereof "contractor".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, lines 18 and 19, strike out "and where appropriate, for terminal liability charges".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 7, strike out "receipts," and insert "receipts."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, after line 7 add the following new subsection:

"(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) (63 Stat. 383), the provisions of section 602(d) (63 Stat. 401), and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended (63 Stat. 377), or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. BOW

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Bow: On page 3, in line 20, strike the period, insert a comma, and the following: "and the inclusion in appropriation acts of provisions regulating the operation of the automatic data processing fund, or limiting the expenditures therefrom, is hereby authorized".

Mr. BOW. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would permit limitations in appropriation acts against the use of the funds in the revolving fund. As this bill is now drawn there is a revolving fund set up and the General Services Administration has authority to make purchases whether authorized by the committees or not. It takes the control away from the Congress and they can go ahead. Under the amendment of the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks], there is a provision that they must report the receipts, disbursements, and transfers to "Miscellaneous receipts." Under this authorization the report shall be made annually in connection with budget estimates to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. All they have to do is report to the Congress what they spend. If they go ahead and spend beyond what the Congress might think is necessary, there is no limitation. All this amendment I am offering does is permit, in the inclusion of appropriation acts, a provision regulating the operation of the automatic data processing funds. It puts a



regulation upon this fund and also permits limiting expenditures so that there can be a limitation if they have gone too far. You see, actually, what this section (c) on page 3 does, and I am sure it was not the intent of the committee to do so, but what it actually does is to give to the General Services Administration the opportunity to go out and buy without any opportunity for the Congress to look it over.

In the subcommittee of which I am a member we have the Weather Bureau coming up before us, and every year we have a question of automatic data processing machines. This would mean they would no longer come to us but the General Services Administration could go out and buy and make a report to us. Then if we did not like it there is not much we could do about it, but if this amendment is adopted it gives the Congress an opportunity to do something about it and to exercise control. I think if we could save \$100 million this is fine, but I think this amendment locks the door in a way and keeps within the Congress control of expenditures rather than delegating to the head of the General Services Administration the opportunity of going out and making the expenditures and only reporting to us and giving us an opportunity of saying, "You should not have done it," but that is all. This will give us the opportunity to make a decision and give control to the Congress and I think we should maintain this control.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOW. I will be delighted to yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Let me say to my distinguished and able friend from Ohio, an important member of the Appropriations Committee which has dealt with this matter for many years, that I appreciate the motive behind his amendment. If the gentleman would yield a little further to me, I would just like to explain that there is no intention that any given agency would not have to get clearance from the legislative committee and from the appropriate subcommittee of the distinguished Committee on Appropriations with full authority over any requests. These funds would go then to the General Services Administration's automatic data processing revolving fund. When funds were taken from the revolving fund GSA would justify it. I do not believe there is any conflict between our ultimate aim of seeing that the Congress has a check on what is done. The Appropriations Committee will have one check, and this amendment as I see it would give them another check.

I want to thank the gentleman for what I think would be a constructive contribution to this legislation. It will give Congress a determined and clear check on every dollar that is spent by this agency or any other for automatic data processing equipment, as it should be.

Mr. BOW. I understand the gentleman is accepting the amendment. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BOW. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. FASCELL. Does the language the gentleman offers authorize language in the appropriation act which would not be otherwise authorized?

Mr. BOW. No, I think not; it would have to be authorized.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Bow].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anyone can find fault with the objectives of this bill but I believe that the bill was introduced rather hastily, that certain agencies of the Government were not given an opportunity to present their views to the committee as is evidenced by the report, wherein the Department of Defense, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Treasury Department, and many others who are the biggest users of these kinds of machines were not given an opportunity to appear before the committee and whose adverse views, including those of the Bureau of the Budget, are expressed in that report.

The National Aeronautics and Space Administration does not have here a letter in the report opposing this bill because it did not have an opportunity to get one in. It was only yesterday that I got a letter from Mr. Webb opposing the legislation or opposing the passage of the legislation in its present form.

Many of my colleagues in the House do not need to be reminded that these agencies use scientific computers and more sophisticated machines. They are not bookkeeping machines for payroll or inventory purposes. There is a great deal of difference between them. These machines are sophisticated. They must be under the control of the people who are using them and they cannot be turned over for other purposes successfully.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The same thing is true of the warning system devices, is that not so?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is true; and the Post Office Department and many others. The Weather Bureau has been mentioned here. These are some of the specialized machines that are used. The Department of Defense is in opposition to it for that reason, not that they do not want to see this done, but I think the best thing that could happen to this bill is to have it returned to the committee with instructions to go into the matter more thoroughly and give these important scientific agencies of Government a chance to plead their case before the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, I hope that I am alone in this, but I find that I am not. There are quite a few who are not experts in this field and who do not understand all of the ramifications of it. If I understand the gentleman

correctly, he and others here who are concerned with the national security feel that this would not be to the best interests of the country; is that correct?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is correct.

Mr. COLMER. If that be true, and the objective gained of trying to save some money, in which all of us are interested—and I am just seeking advice because, as I say, I do not know a great deal about this—why would it not be a good idea to amend this bill to exempt the Department of Defense, as suggested by the gentlemen interested in this subject, such as the distinguished gentleman from California who is now addressing the House? I just throw that out for what it is worth.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think this would be good, but who is going to say what agencies should be exempted from the bill? I can name a dozen. Maybe some of them should not be in; maybe some should be out. We just have not had time to study the matter properly. It is a complicated bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman on the statement he has made and the position he has taken. I ask him again if under the circumstances he does not agree it is a matter of futility to try to rewrite this bill dealing with so complex a matter on the floor of the House? Would not the reasonable, logical solution be to send it back to the committee and have the full and exhaustive exploration the subject deserves?

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree entirely with the gentleman. You cannot write the bill on the floor of the House, and in its present form it is not a good bill.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND  
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,  
Washington, D.C. July 17, 1963.

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER,  
Chairman, Committee on Science and Astro-  
navitics, House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This replies to your request for the views of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration on the bill, H.R. 5171, "to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of electronic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies." The bill is on the Union Calendar of the House of Representatives, and this report is directed to the form of the bill in which it appears on that calendar. We understand that it is scheduled for debate tomorrow, July 18, 1963. Due to the urgency of your request, time has not permitted the submission of this report to the Bureau of the Budget for advice as to its relationship to the program of the President.

H.R. 5171 would, through the addition of a new section 111 to the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, provide for the assumption by the Administrator of General Services of responsibility for the acquisition, maintenance, and use of most, if not all, automatic data

processing equipment required by agencies of the Federal Government for both in-house and contracted automatic data processing activity.

Among the more important aspects of the legislation are provisions under which:

1. The General Services Administration would be made responsible for providing automatic data processing equipment "suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies"; to carry out this responsibility the General Services Administration could not only buy or lease equipment, but could transfer equipment between agencies, require its joint utilization, and establish pools and data processing centers.

2. The General Services Administration could delegate its authority to acquire and utilize "individual automatic data processing systems or specific units" when necessary "for the economy and efficiency of operations" or where "essential to defense or security."

3. The program would be financed by a revolving fund into which agencies using automatic data processing equipment would make advances and reimbursements to pay for services rendered.

4. Provisions of law inconsistent with the purposes of H.R. 5171 would be made inapplicable.

5. Under Section 111(a), the Administrator of the General Services Administration would be authorized and directed to coordinate and control the purchase, lease, maintenance, and use of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies. The wording of this passage is so broad that not only "in-house" automatic data processing and automatic data processing work contracted out as such, but also apparently any contract or procurement, the performance of which entails any automatic data processing, could be scrutinized by the General Services Administration for "economy and efficiency" of equipment utilization.

6. Section 111(b) would direct that ADP equipment suitable for efficient and effective use by Federal agencies shall be provided by the General Services Administration. It is not clear whether the General Services Administration would merely act as an administrative intermediary in providing all types of ADP equipment requested by an agency or whether the provision would effectively lodge in the General Services Administration the authority to review agency requests for equipment and to approve, modify, or deny them by determining that the equipment requested is, or is not, "suitable for efficient and effective use." If the latter situation should develop, the provision might seriously impede, rather than aid, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration in discharging operative responsibilities set forth in the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958, as amended. Section 203 of the Space Act requires, for example, that NASA arrange for participation by the scientific community in planning specialized scientific measurements and observations, and authorizes the Administration to enter into those "contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, or other transactions as may be necessary in the conduct of its work and on such terms as it may deem appropriate." For those projects requiring ADP the statutory grant set forth in the Space Act would be severely circumscribed were the General Services Administration assigned a share in deciding whether the ADP equipment requested for a given project was "suitable for efficient and effective use" or whether the "joint utilization" of the equipment with other Federal agencies was necessary and proper under the circumstances.

As of June 30, 1963, the National Aeronautics and Space Administration had an inventory of 118 general-purpose digital computer systems ranging from 25 very large systems

to small "desk" computers available for the direct use of individual scientists and engineers in their daily activities. Only 7 of the 118 computer systems are used full time for administrative applications. The remainder are used on substantive scientific and engineering tasks required by NASA programs. The latter can be classified into five broad areas: (1) theoretical and analytical investigations; (2) engineering studies; (3) simulation; (4) space flight operations; and (5) processing scientific and engineering experimental data. Several days ago, Mr. Edmond C. Buckley, Director of NASA's Office of Tracking and Data Acquisition, submitted to the Census and Government Statistics Subcommittee of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service a statement on the scientific and technical uses of computers in the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. It provides a rather complete report on this subject which you might find helpful. I am enclosing a copy for your use.

From the foregoing and the attachment, it appears that the scientific and technical use and management of computers cannot be separated from the responsibility for conducting the national space program. The bill would necessarily have the effect of fragmenting and watering down that responsibility. Accordingly, I see no alternative but to recommend that NASA be exempted from the terms of the bill.

In this connection, reference is made to the exemption in section of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act, section 602(d) (40 U.S.C., sec. 474). This section provides that "Nothing in this Act shall impair or affect any authority of \* \* \* (3) any executive agency named in the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, and the head thereof, with respect to the administration of said Act." The National Aeronautics and Space Administration is such an agency. Section 111(e) of H.R. 5171 would make this exemption unavailable since it declares that—

"(e) The proviso accompanying section 201(a) \* \* \* the provisions of section 602(d) and any other provisions of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, or of any other provisions of law which are inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable."

Accordingly, we suggest and recommend that section 111(e) of the bill be modified to read:

"(e) Any provision of law inconsistent with the purposes and provisions of section 111 shall not be applicable: *Provided, however,* That section 111 shall have no application for any purpose to the departments and agencies of the Federal Government enumerated in section 2304 of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947, as amended, 10 U.S.C. 2303."

Sincerely yours,

JAMES E. WEBB,  
Administrator.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GARY

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. Gary: Page 1, line 7, after "coordinate and" strike out "control the" and insert "provide for the economic and efficient".

Page 1, line 7, after "lease," insert "and".

Page 1, line 8, strike out the comma and the words "and use".

Page 2, line 2, strike out "operate or".

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment merely takes care of the suggestions I made during my remarks on the bill. It strikes out the control,

use, and operation of this equipment by the General Services Administration. With the amendment the section would read:

The Administrator is authorized and directed to coordinate and provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by, or at the expense of, Federal agencies, and to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

That is the sole purpose of the amendment.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have talked with the gentleman from Virginia. I think everybody agrees that if there is a coordination program no one is trying to force anyone to do things. We would like to encourage them to save this \$100 million instead of building their little empires. But I do not think there is anything devastating about this amendment. I think there might be difficulty in this word "operate." I believe we would be very wise not to try to strike the word "operate" on page 2. If you strike the words "control" and "use" you will give the Administrator authority to coordinate the purchase, lease, and maintenance of automatic data processing equipment by or at the expense of Federal agencies, and to operate or provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise, of such equipment.

I think they sometimes may need to operate this equipment. I think to strike it from the language of the bill would be inappropriate. I would offer a substitute which would only strike the words "control the" and strike the word "use."

Mr. GARY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to my distinguished friend, the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GARY. I would like to say to the distinguished gentleman and to the chairman, I do not think striking the word "operate" has much effect except that I am afraid if you give them general authority to operate this machinery that that would mean all of the machinery. I leave in the language of the bill the words "to provide for the operation by delegation of authority or otherwise of such equipment," which I take it would mean to operate their own equipment. I think they ought to have the authority to operate their own equipment and to delegate that to somebody else if they are fit to do so.

Mr. BROOKS. I would say it may well be that that is true. I have not had an opportunity to study this particular language of the amendment at great length so I believe I will not offer the substitute amendment to which I referred. I thank my colleague for his consideration and I appreciate his support on this legislation. We would both like to save some money as my colleague pointed out.

Mr. GARY. I am all for saving the money, and moreover I think it can be saved by coordination of the purchasing, leasing, and maintenance of this equipment. We have already saved a great



deal by the action of our committee but I do not want to leave any doubt in anybody's mind that we are giving the GSA the right to use and operate this equipment that is already under control of the various agencies.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank my colleague.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to direct a question or two to my good friend, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. GARY]. Will the gentleman clarify the word that is being stricken in his amendment?

Mr. GARY. The word "operate."

Mr. JOHANSEN. That is the word that would be stricken?

Mr. GARY. That is correct.

Mr. JOHANSEN. May I ask the gentleman this question: Whether or not we are in danger here of getting into quite a word game and a semantic operation? I wonder if, with the uncertainty as to what the effect might or might not be, of deleting one word or adding another, this is the best way of handling the matter. I ask the gentleman if he does not feel that the committee is a much better area in which to work out these problems and then to come back with something after an exploration of the practicalities of the matter rather than attempting to do this on the floor of the House?

Mr. GARY. Well, of course, the committee could do a more thorough job, but I am particularly anxious to have it absolutely understood, and I think with the explanation of my amendment here on the floor of the House, it will be plain that what we are trying to do by striking out the word "operate" is to insure the fact that the GSA will not attempt to operate the machinery that is under control of the Defense Department or under the control of NASA or of any other agency of Government.

Mr. JOHANSEN. I commend the gentleman for his purpose. But I entertain serious doubts, I will say to the gentleman, as to whether with the retention of the word "control" or the retention of the word "use" that purpose is made clear.

Mr. GARY. They have both been stricken by my amendment. It deletes the word "use" and also the word "control."

Mr. JOHANSEN. Then I will say to the gentleman, while I subscribe to his purpose and commend him for it, I think it is a sorry bit of legislating to come in here with a bill in which the key word is "control" and in which the committee commits itself to building up this kind of power, and then here in the matter of an hour or an hour and one-half of debate it completely backtracks.

And then they ask us to try to doctor up the bill with some namby-pamby euphemisms and kindlier words.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is defeated, not because I disagree with my friend's purpose, but I do not want us to kid ourselves that we are improving this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of asking someone the question as to

where I can find a definition of "Federal agency." This bill is predicated upon "Federal agency." I would like an official definition of the words "Federal agency."

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I believe that definition is contained in the basic act. This bill seeks to amend the basic act, and I am sure that that term is defined in that act. If the gentleman will give us a minute or two, I think we can locate the definition of it. Most of them, I am sure, the gentleman from Iowa is familiar with. There are a large number of agencies. We are interested in those, however, who use automatic data processing equipment.

The gentleman could probably in his own mind write down a list of the number of them.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, I have some idea of what constitutes a Federal agency, but I do not know whether, for instance, the Department of Defense is legally a Federal agency, or the Department of the Treasury is legally a Federal agency.

Mr. BROOKS. I believe in the Federal Property Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, revised December 1, 1958, on page 4, we have the definition of the words that we use. Section 3 as used in titles 1 through 6 of this act, part B, the term "Federal agency" means any executive agency or any establishment in the legislative or the judicial branches of the Government—except the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Architect of the Capitol, and any activities under his direction.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman, but I would add that the definition just given was apparently written by the committee.

Mr. Chairman I am as much interested in saving money as any Member of the House, but up to this point no one has convinced me that centralization as proposed in this bill will provide any part of the claimed savings. Earlier this afternoon I asked the question as to the basis for the claimed savings and I am still awaiting an answer.

I would point out that in the past 2 years the Government has purchased millions of dollars worth of equipment to provide automation and yet in the same period some 150,000 persons have been added to the Federal payroll.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I, of course, am very reluctant to disagree with my good friend, the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. BROOKS]. But at the appropriate time I expect to offer a motion to recommit this bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill is probably the best example of poor coordination within the Congress that has been on the floor of the House in a long time. The moment I saw this bill on the calendar I contacted the two agencies with which I have very close relationships, NASA, and the Veterans' Administration. I find that both of them are opposed to the bill. If you read further in the report you find the Post Office Department,

the Defense Department, the Department of Agriculture, the Department of Labor, the Atomic Energy Commission, the Federal Aviation Agency, also are opposed to the bill.

Mr. Chairman, we have just completed months of hearings on the NASA authorization. During these hearings we asked representatives of NASA questions about this equipment. This is a question which has a tremendous effect on every agency. We asked whether or not there is not some executive policy on this whole question, and we were told that it was being worked on, but it was not.

Mr. Chairman, I think this legislation is premature. I think it should be given much more consideration among the other committees of Congress and among the other agencies of Government.

Mr. Chairman, I shall offer a motion to recommit the bill at the proper time.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Surely, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BROOKS. It does pain me to have a difference with my old and dear friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE]. But I would say that I am glad that all of the members of the committee have asked questions of the agencies with which they are so directly concerned, those in particular.

I would say that the Comptroller General, who works for us as Members of Congress, sent in a letter—not an old letter, but I believe it is dated June 11, 1963—a copy of a letter which he sent to the Speaker of this great body, in which he said:

Our review disclosed that, during fiscal years 1961 and 1962 and part of fiscal year 1963, Goddard Space Flight Center made rental overpayments for automatic data-processing machines because it failed to determine and consolidate operational use time in accordance with provisions of the Federal supply schedule contracts. We estimate that the overpayments amount to about \$1.2 million.

Now, I do not say that everyone does not make mistakes. But I think that this bill, in fairness to my colleague—

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I hope the gentleman will not take all of my time.

Mr. BROOKS. I think the gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE], in fairness, should be given every opportunity to continue to question these agencies, as I think you have full authority to do, and I think you should exercise it as you do. But this legislation would take no authority away from your great committee or any other congressional committee, and no authority away from the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. You understand why some of the agencies that would be restricted would sort of be chastised in overpaying \$1,231,000, to be exact. You can understand why they are not very enthusiastic about anybody taking a look at their operations.

They did not offer a criticism. My obligation is not to the individual agencies, but, as yours is, I think you will agree, to the people who pay the taxes and expect efficiency from every agency whether we work with them or not.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. I am glad to say to the gentleman that I requested the General Accounting Office to furnish me the report he made on NASA. I have seen the report. I know the gentleman has it, and I will sooner or later find out why I did not get a copy of it. Our committee was not furnished a copy of it, neither was I furnished a copy. I have seen the gentleman's report and I know it. But why did not the General Accounting Office send us this report? The amount is tremendous and it is going to get bigger and bigger as time goes on, particularly in NASA. The amount there is fantastic. We did ask the question, and we were told that there is a policy being formulated by the Government that would control it.

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think a statement has to be made in fairness to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration with regard to the overpayment that was spoken of by the distinguished gentleman from Texas. It is exactly true, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. Brooks] has said. The report of the General Accounting Office showed \$1.2 million as an overpayment. In fairness now to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, I think the Members should know that the discovery of the overpayment was, as a matter of fact, a discovery made by NASA. NASA learned that they were making some kind of an overpayment and because they learned this fact, they put a kind of counting device, time device, on the computers. Then with the use of these timing devices on the computers NASA learned how much the overpayment was and at what rate this was going. It was the General Accounting Office that revealed the overpayment to the Congress and to the public in general, but it was NASA itself that found the fact of overpayment, indeed that made it possible to find the overpayment. Then they went ahead and negotiated for a refund of the overpayment, and I understand the amount of the refund as agreed upon is \$1.1 million.

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. FASCELL. Was the committee advised by the agency over which it has jurisdiction?

Mr. OLSEN of Montana. The committee on which I serve was advised by the General Accounting Office first. I want to give them credit for having first revealed this fact, but it was not because NASA was concealing it. NASA had actually been responsible for finding the overpayment or the effect of it in computing the overpayment. NASA, by the way, appeared before our committee and revealed it as well and gave full credit to GAO and as well to justify their activity and exonerate themselves for having found an error and took credit by correcting the error.

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time simply to correct some of the statements that

have been made. I am quite sure they were made in good faith, but, nevertheless, they are in error.

The Comptroller General did write a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics in which he did say that in his opinion there had been an overpayment by NASA to the International Business Machines Corp. and that in his judgment the amount of the overpayment was \$1.1 million.

That report was referred to the Subcommittee on Tracking and Data Acquisition, of which my colleague, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. HECHLER], is chairman.

The subcommittee referred that report to me, perhaps for the reason that I had had quite a bit to say in our subcommittee hearings on the question of computers. I was requested to look into the matter and see what I could make of this reported overcharge. I did do that and I spent the better part of an afternoon in conference with officials of the International Business Machines Corp. During that discussion it became apparent, as I have said earlier on the floor today, that the matter was far more complex than the Comptroller General himself had realized. However, it was not disputed by the International Business Machines Corp. that there might very well have been an overpayment. It came to light that the computer system, the automatic data processing system, can be linked up in an extremely wide variety of ways. In some hookups, or in some linkages, you might use three tape drives and one computer and one memory circuit, whereas in another system you might use a different set of components. Each component did not have a separate meter upon it. Furthermore, the machines are energized not only while they are in use, but they are energized while they are being overhauled, and when preventive maintenance was being performed upon them or when they were broken down and being repaired. None of these things have been metered or have been subjected to precise measurements.

Following my conference with the officials of the International Business Machines Corp. an agreement was reached based not upon anybody's measurement, but based simply upon an educated guess as to what the overpayment might have been. The actual refund made by the International Business Machines to NASA was over \$1.2 million, although the Comptroller General's estimate was that it was \$1.1 million. The whole point of the matter is that it suddenly came to light that a great deal more accuracy was needed in the computation of time. I might add at this point that the International Business Machines Corp. does not meter the time. It was strictly up to NASA to do it. NASA had not done it with the degree of specific accuracy as to each component which would have been necessary to make possible an accurate billing by International Business Machines to NASA.

I am for this bill and I think we need some agency of the Government to develop that degree of specialized knowledge which will enable them to go into

any agency of the Government and find out whether a sensible, economical, and thrifty use is being made of automatic data processing equipment. We do not have such an agency at this point.

As to the particular language of the amendment I do not see why we cannot afford to strike the word "operate." We do not want the General Services Administration operating this equipment, but we certainly need an agency and I think the General Services Administration is the best one to do it, to go in and see whether they have the right equipment and whether the right methods are being used to determine how they use the equipment and what type and kind of equipment they ought to have, as well as should the equipment be leased, or whether it ought to be bought outright by the Government.

For the reasons I have stated I urge the membership of this Committee to support this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. POOL

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. POOL: Page 5, line 4, strike out the quotation marks.

Page 5, immediately after line 4, insert the following:

"(f) Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, or any other provision of law, no punched card machine shall be purchased or leased under authority of this section by negotiation. Each punched card machine which is purchased or leased under this section shall be so purchased or leased after public advertisement in accordance with subsection (a) of section 303 of this Act, and the award for such purchase or lease shall be made to the lowest responsible bidder notwithstanding any provision of subsection (b) of section 303."

Mr. POOL. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas, JACK BROOKS, has sponsored this bill and made a speech here earlier, as did my distinguished colleague from New Jersey [Mr. WALLHAUSER]. They pointed out that the main purpose of this bill is to save approximately \$100 million a year. I want to help this bill a little bit, so I have offered an amendment to give the contract to the lowest bidder.

First, I want to point out that from the work I have done on this matter, I found that none of these machines is presently bought on a low-bid basis, either by custom or under the terminology of the statutes. Many of the contracts are negotiated. So I offered this amendment in view of the fact that one of the purposes stated in this bill is to save the Government money. Let us save some money by giving the contract to the lowest bidder. This amendment will save the Government a great deal more money by requiring that when punched card machines are purchased or leased, the lowest responsible bidder will get the contract. That is all it does.

Mr. Chairman, I have limited the amendment to punched card machines



because upon investigation I found that these are about the only machines on which you can get three or four bidders. The electronic computers are so complex that it would prove virtually impossible to spell out the specifications which would allow enough bidders a chance to offer competitive bids on them. But, on punchcard machines, I have been told that the industry has been developed to the point where it is possible to get a low bid. That is all my amendment does. I think the lowest responsible bidder should get the contract. The same thing is done in many other fields of Government.

There is no reason why we should not do it here, if possible. And it is possible with respect to punched card machines.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POOL. I yield to my friend from South Carolina.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleague, the distinguished gentleman from Texas, with whom I have the privilege of serving on the Subcommittee on Census and Statistics of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service. We have studied this particular problem for a considerable period of time. I want to associate myself with his amendment and would like to ask him just a question or two to help develop this a little bit further.

Did not the Comptroller General, Mr. Campbell, appear before our committee and discuss this particular matter of competitive bidding as distinguished from negotiated contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct.

Mr. WATSON. And did he not at that time say that the Government had lost millions of dollars because of negotiated contracts on automatic data processing machines, instead of going into competitive bid contracts?

Mr. POOL. That is correct. I think he went further than that and said that with respect to punched card machines it would be entirely possible to set up specifications so that the awarding of the contract could be made to the lowest bidder.

Mr. WATSON. Does not the gentleman also recall further that although he did not testify before our committee, the Secretary of Defense, Mr. McNamara, recently made a public statement, which we all applaud, that he had saved some \$100 million, or perhaps in excess of that, over the past year through competitive bid contracts instead of negotiated contracts? And he cited as one particular example, I believe, of a radio or some electronic device for which originally the Department of Defense had been paying something like \$2,000 but which under competitive bidding they got down to about \$800?

Mr. POOL. That is right. And this is a very similar situation. When they first came out, the punched card machines were all different and it was difficult for a department to specify what they needed. It was difficult for the industry to bid on specifications that were so general. So they had to negotiate. But we are now in the position where, instead of 3 or 4 compa-

nies being in a position to bid maybe 10 or 15 of them could get in a bidding position if we pass an amendment such as this one. It would save the Government thousands of dollars.

Mr. WATSON. Under the gentleman's position, this would not apply to other equipment?

Mr. POOL. No. That is why we limit it specifically to punched card machines, because we can do it in this field.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment basically provides for no negotiated sales in the limited field of punchcards. I believe this is not trying to legislate on purchase practices. I believe there is some merit to the suggestion. I would be delighted and pleased to cooperate with the distinguished Member-at-Large from Texas in pursuance of this, but I feel that it is more arbitrary than we in this Congress would want to establish as a precedent. The statement that you would never buy anything by negotiation has not proved to be good business for the country. As an example, we sometimes do negotiate sales but they ought to be submitted to the Congress for approval. I think this is good policy. Where there is only one supplier or where there is one producer of a given commodity, you might well negotiate a purchase price with that individual, if you bought for the Government or for yourself or for private business. If you bought for the Government on a negotiated contract, I think it would be wise to provide for Congressional approval or renegotiation.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment and hope it will be defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WATSON) there were—ayes 49, noes 61.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the Chair, Mr. ASHLEY, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 5171) pursuant to House Resolution 432, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The question is on the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. JOHANSEN. I am, Mr. Speaker. The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHANSEN moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 5171, to the Committee on Government Operations.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. JOHANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 258, not voting 79, as follows:

[Roll No. 101]  
YEAS—96

Abele	Fuqua	Mosher
Ayres	Gavin	Norblad
Becker	Gross	Olsen, Mont.
Beermann	Grover	Olsen, Minn.
Bell	Gubser	Pike
Bray	Gurney	Pirnie
Bromwell	Haley	Poage
Bruce	Hall	Pool
Burkhalter	Harvey, Mich.	Quillen
Burton	Hemphill	Rivers, S.C.
Cameron	Henderson	Roberts, Tex.
Casey	Herlong	Saylor
Cederberg	Hoeven	Schadeberg
Chamberlain	Jensen	Secrest
Chelf	Johansen	Senner
Cohelan	Karth	Short
Collier	King, N.Y.	Sikes
Colmer	Knox	Staggers
Corbett	Kyl	Stratton
Cunningham	MacGregor	Teague, Tex.
Curtin	Mahon	Tuten
Derounian	Martin, Calif.	Udall
Devine	Martin, Nebr.	Utt
Dole	May	Van Felt
Dulski	Meador	Vinson
Edwards	Michel	Watson
Ellsworth	Miller, Calif.	Weaver
Everett	Milliken	Westland
Feighan	Montoya	Whitener
Frelinghuysen	Moore	Whitten
Fulton, Pa.	Morris	Wickersham
Fulton, Tenn.	Morse	Winstead

NAYS—258

Abbott	Byrnes, Wis.	Gary
Addabbo	Cahill	Gathings
Albert	Cannon	Gibbons
Alger	Carey	Gilbert
Anderson	Celler	Glenn
Andrews	Chenoweth	Gonzalez
Arends	Clark	Goodell
Ashley	Cleveland	Grant
Ashmore	Cooley	Gray
Aspinall	Corman	Green, Oreg.
Auchincloss	Cramer	Griffiths
Avery	Curtis	Hagan, Ga.
Baker	Daniels	Halpern
Baldwin	Davis, Ga.	Hanna
Baring	Davis, Tenn.	Hansen
Barry	Dawson	Harding
Bass	Delaney	Hardy
Bates	Dent	Harris
Battin	Denton	Harrison
Beckworth	Derwinski	Harvey, Ind.
Bennett, Fla.	Diggs	Hays
Berry	Dingell	Healey
Betts	Dorn	Hébert
Blatnik	Dowdy	Hechler
Boggs	Downing	Hollifield
Boland	Duncan	Holland
Bolling	Dwyer	Horton
Bolton	Elliott	Hosmer
Bolton, Frances P.	Fallon	Huddleston
Bolton, Oliver P.	Fascell	Hull
Bow	Findley	Hutchinson
Brademas	Finnegan	Ichord
Brock	Fisher	Jarman
Brooks	Flood	Jennings
Brotzman	Flynt	Joelson
Brown, Calif.	Fogarty	Johnson, Wis.
Brown, Ohio	Ford	Jones, Mo.
Broyhill, N.C.	Foreman	Karsten
Burke	Fountain	Kee
Burleson	Fraser	Keith
Byrne, Pa.	Friedel	Keogh
	Gallagher	Kilgore

King, Calif.  
Klirwan  
Kluczynski  
Kornegay  
Kunkel  
Laird  
Langen  
Lankford  
Lennon  
Libonati  
Lindsay  
Lipscomb  
Lloyd  
Long, Md.  
McClary  
McCulloch  
McDade  
McDowell  
McFall  
Macdonald  
Madden  
Malliard  
Marsh  
Matsunaga  
Matthews  
Mills  
Minish  
Monagan  
Moorhead  
Morgan  
Morton  
Muller  
Murphy, Ill.  
Murphy, N.Y.  
Murray  
Natcher  
Nedzi  
Nix  
O'Brien, N.Y.  
O'Hara, Ill.  
O'Hara, Mich.  
O'Konski  
O'Neill  
Osmer  
Ostertag

Passman  
Patman  
Patten  
Pelly  
Pepper  
Perkins  
Pilcher  
Poff  
Powell  
Price  
Pucinski  
Quile  
Rains  
Randall  
Reid, Ill.  
Reid, N.Y.  
Reifel  
Reuss  
Rhodes, Ariz.  
Rhodes, Pa.  
Rich  
Riehlman  
Rivers, Alaska  
Roberts, Ala.  
Robison  
Rodino  
Rogers, Colo.  
Rogers, Fla.  
Rogers, Tex.  
Rosenthal  
Roudebush  
Roush  
Rumsfeld  
Ryan, Mich.  
Ryan, N.Y.  
St. George  
St. Germain  
Schenck  
Schneebeli  
Schweiker  
Schwengel  
Selden  
Shipley  
Shriver  
Sibal

Sickles  
Siler  
Sisk  
Skubitz  
Smith, Calif.  
Smith, Iowa  
Smith, Va.  
Snyder  
Springer  
Staebler  
Stafford  
Stinson  
Stubblefield  
Sullivan  
Talcott  
Taylor  
Teague, Calif.  
Thomas  
Thompson, N.J.  
Thompson, Tex.  
Thomson, Wis.  
Thornberry  
Toll  
Tollefson  
Tuck  
Tullman  
Ullman  
Van Deerlin  
Vanik  
Waggoner  
Wallhauser  
Watts  
Weltner  
Whalley  
Widnall  
Williams  
Willis  
Wilson  
Charles H.  
Wilson, Ind.  
Wright  
Wyman  
Young  
Younger  
Zablocki

## NOT VOTING—79

Abernethy  
Adair  
Ashbrook  
Barrett  
Belcher  
Bennett, Mich.  
Bonner  
Broomfield  
Broyhill, Va.  
Buckley  
Clancy  
Clausen  
Don H.  
Clawson, Del.  
Conte  
Daddario  
Dague  
Donohue  
Edmondson  
Evins  
Farbstein  
Fino  
Forrester  
Garmatz  
Gialmo  
Gill  
Goodling

Grabowski  
Green, Pa.  
Griffin  
Hagen, Calif.  
Halleck  
Harsha  
Hawkins  
Hoffman  
Horan  
Johnson, Calif.  
Jonas  
Jones, Ala.  
Kastenmeier  
Kelly  
Kilburn  
Landrum  
Latta  
Leggett  
Lesinski  
Long, La.  
McIntire  
McLoskey  
McMillan  
Martin, Mass.  
Mathias  
Miller, N.Y.  
Minshall

Morrison  
Moss  
Nelsen  
Nygaard  
O'Brien, Ill.  
Philbin  
Pillion  
Purcell  
Rooney  
Roosevelt  
Rostenkowski  
Roybal  
St. Onge  
Scott  
Shelley  
Sheppard  
Slack  
Steed  
Stephens  
Taft  
Thompson, La.  
Trimble  
Wharton  
White  
Wilson, Bob  
Wylder

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:  
Mr. Abernethy for, with Mr. Trimble against.  
Mr. Bob Wilson for, with Mr. Nelsen against.  
Mr. Fino for, with Mr. Garmatz against.  
Mr. Horan for, with Mr. McIntire against.  
Mr. Nygaard for, with Mr. Rooney against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Dague.  
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Broyhill of Virginia.  
Mr. Moss with Mr. Ashbrook.  
Mr. Johnson of California with Mr. Don H. Clausen.

Mr. Hagen of California with Mr. Wharton.  
Mr. Roybal with Mr. Taft.  
Mr. Leggett with Mr. Bennett of Michigan.  
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Del Clawson.  
Mr. St. Onge with Mr. Adair.  
Mr. Daddario with Mr. Hoffman.

Mr. Gialmo with Mr. Pillion.  
Mr. Grabowski with Mr. Broomfield.  
Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Miller of New York.  
Mrs. Kelly with Mr. Clancy.  
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Goodling.  
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Minshall.  
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Wylder.  
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Griffin.  
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Martin of Nebraska.  
Mr. White with Mr. Latta.  
Mr. Donohue with Mr. Kilburn.  
Mr. Philbin with Mr. Jonas.  
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.  
Mr. Rostenkowski with Mr. Conte.  
Mr. Slack with Mr. Belcher.  
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. McLoskey.  
Mr. Landrum with Mr. Harsha.  
Mr. Forrester with Mr. McMillan.  
Mr. Kastenmeier with Mr. Stephens.  
Mr. Steed with Mr. Bonner.  
Mr. Edmondson with Mr. Evins.  
Mr. Hawkins with Mr. Scott.  
Mr. Jones of Alabama with Mr. Long of Louisiana.  
Mr. Purcell with Mr. Gill.

Mr. FLOOD, Mr. JONES of Missouri, Mr. BATES, and Mr. BARRY changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Administrator of the General Services Administration to coordinate and otherwise provide for the economic and efficient purchase, lease, maintenance, operation, and utilization of automatic data processing equipment by Federal departments and agencies."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

## PERSONAL ANNOUNCEMENT

Mr. WELTNER. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, 1963, several members of the Georgia delegation, myself included, were in Georgia to confer with the Governor on a matter of public importance. Accordingly, I am recorded as not voting on rollcall No. 95, taken on a motion to recommit the bill, H.R. 4897, to amend the Wartime Sedition Act. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted "nay" on the motion to recommit, and "aye" on final passage of the bill.

## PARTICIPATION BY MILITARY PERSONNEL IN CIVIL RIGHTS DEMONSTRATIONS

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, during the debate on the Defense Department appropriations bill, I made mention of a report released by the President's Committee on Equal Opportunity in the Armed Forces. I stated that this report indicated a real threat to our military bases as it presupposed that unless an area adjacent to a military base was integrated, the people in the area would be punished by removal of the base. It also called upon military commanders to take the lead in the communities in the desegregation movement. At that time, I stated that such action as contemplated by the report was not considered by military officers when they entered the service of their country and I do not believe that they are qualified either by education or experience to enter into such programs.

I bring this to the attention of the House today, Mr. Speaker, since I read an article in the July 17, 1963 issue of the Washington Post, referring to orders issued at the Military Air Transport Base, Charleston, S.C. One order stated that base personnel were not to take part in civil rights demonstrations. Later, the order was revoked by a second order which stated that under Air Force policy, an airman off-duty could take part in demonstrations as long as he wore civilian clothes and avoided injury that might prevent him from carrying out his duties.

The article further stated that the Secretary of Defense, in the face of protests, sharply restricted such activities last night.

The Secretary said in a memorandum to all Armed Forces:

It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly.

The article further noted that Secretary McNamara did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes in off-duty hours.

Mr. Speaker, I submit that the order issued by the Secretary of Defense leaves much to be desired. Military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. Participation in demonstrations such as have occurred have led to bodily injury. If military personnel is permitted to participate in these demonstrations and become incapacitated, they are not available for the intended purpose of the services. Further, Mr. Speaker, if injury occurs in any demonstration and where there are local ordinances or State laws forbidding such demonstrations, I would like to know how such injury could be found "in line of duty." It would appear that in such case a "not in line of duty" finding would follow and, therefore, the individual would be subject to court-martial proceedings.

In view of the importance of such action that could occur, I have written



Secretary McNamara for an opinion on the matter. The letter follows:

JULY 17, 1963.

HON. ROBERT S. McNAMARA,  
Secretary of Defense,  
Pentagon Building,  
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In view of your recent memorandum wherein you stated, "It is highly inappropriate and unnecessary for military personnel, with their special obligations of citizenship, to participate in these activities. I urge every man and woman in uniform to conduct himself accordingly."

I would like to propound a question regarding this memorandum, particularly, since you did not specifically forbid participation by troops when wearing civilian clothes in off-duty hours.

It is my understanding that military personnel are subject to call 24 hours a day. If injury occurs to military personnel in off-duty hours, wearing civilian clothes which was the result of demonstrations which are contrary to the laws of the municipality or the State, how could such injury be found "in line of duty?"

It would appear that if such injury did occur to military personnel as a result of these demonstrations, such injuries would necessarily be found "not in line of duty" and they would be, of course, subject to court-martial proceedings.

I would appreciate your comments in this regard at the earliest opportunity.

With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

KENNETH A. ROBERTS.

#### LET'S GET WASHINGTON OFF THE GROUND

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, news reports last weekend indicated that President Kennedy spent part of his leisure time on Cape Cod flying kites.

Those who remained behind to swelter in the muggy heat of Washington might wonder why our President must leave town to do his kite flying. What is wrong, they may ask, with the White House lawn?

I have the answer and now, in support of the President, I must reveal it. Kite flying is illegal in the District of Columbia.

Alas, it is true. Congress, in its wisdom as benevolent overseer of the health and morals of our Capital, passed a law in 1892 which provides:

It shall not be lawful for any person or persons to set up or fly any kite, or set up or fly any \* \* \* balloon or parachute in or upon or over any street, avenue, alley, open space, public enclosure, or square within the limits of the city of Washington, under a penalty of not more than \$10 for each and every such offense.

President Kennedy, being a law-abiding citizen, was thus forced to leave our beautiful city in order to educate his children in the artful joys of kite flying.

Yet how many of us, chained to our work in Washington, would not like to

give our children the advantages we once enjoyed? Why should Washingtonians, until only recently deprived of the vote and still deprived of the right to govern themselves, be forbidden to take to the open spaces on breezy days to partake in the joy of flying kites? Indeed, had Benjamin Franklin been born in Washington we might all be languishing in darkness of this day.

It is my duty, therefore, not only as a legislator and a father, but as one who believes that the Declaration of Independence is a living document, to do all in my power to throw off the yoke of tyranny. Accordingly, I am today introducing legislation to repeal the kite flying prohibition in Washington.

Lest my bill not be taken seriously, let me point out some practical implications of this oppressive law. The statute, you may note, applies not only to kites, but to balloons as well. What student of political science does not know the value of the trial balloon as an instrument of government? Are we now to label all our Chief Executives—not to mention aspirants to that great office—common criminals when they send aloft the name of a prospective Cabinet appointee? May a member of Congress no longer dip his toe, so to speak, into the pool of public opinion without risking punishment? To pose these questions is to answer them. The law must go!

What about the businessman who instructs his secretary to tell an insurance salesman to "go fly a kite?" Is he now to be punished for soliciting the commission of a crime? With our courts and law enforcement officials under fire for being soft on criminals, what can we expect from strict enforcement of the kite-flying law? The prospects are staggering. If one gets "high as a kite," for example, will he now be subject to criminal punishment as well as the scorn of his wife?

Consider, moreover, the problem of enforcement. To make the law really work should not the helicopter squadron of the Metropolitan Police Force be quadrupled? And how many \$10 fines does it take to buy a helicopter? How about the insanity defense? Will we jam St. Elizabeths with psychopathic personalities whose mental aberrations compel them to fly kites?

Finally, what of our children? Innocent and untutored in the ways of adult society, they follow the natural instincts of childhood and aspire to the sky. Are we now to brand with infamy every tot who builds a kite and sails it aloft over Washington's streets, avenues, alleys, open spaces, public enclosures, or squares? The law must go.

Debate will continue I am sure, over juvenile delinquency and over home rule for Washington, but all that is right and good demands that my bill be passed. Surely this is a problem concerning all American citizens. So while Washingtonians must be content to demonstrate, I urge all people of good will beyond the boundaries of our Capital to write their Congressman in support of this legislation.

#### ARMS CONTROL AND DISARMAMENT AGENCY

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, when the Arms Control and Disarmament Act was passed by Congress in 1961, it contained a ceiling on the amount which could be appropriated for the purposes of the act. Since 1961, all but \$1.7 million of the \$10 million authorized has been appropriated to further the important work of this instrument for national security.

The budget request of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency for fiscal 1964 is \$15 million, which reflects the demand for its services and the increasing complexity of its work. Of this amount, \$11 million has been allotted to research conducted by those outside the Agency, which insures the objectivity of its final recommendations. The remaining \$4 million is for research by Agency personnel, for administrative expenses, and for making the product of research and study available at the negotiating table. It is obvious that, if the work of the Agency is to continue, the legislative ceiling on appropriations must be lifted. This is the primary purpose of the bill I am introducing today and to which I lend my wholehearted support.

The eventual control of nuclear weapons, toward which a test ban is a first step, the prevention of the proliferation of nuclear weapons technology, and the reduction of radioactive fallout are national objectives of the highest importance. The United States has striven for these goals in over 70 meetings and conferences with the Soviet Union since the end of World War II. Crucial discussions are even now going on in Moscow, discussions to which our ablest negotiators have been sent. In a laudable effort to break the iron grip of mutual suspicion, President Kennedy has declared a moratorium on atmospheric tests by the United States. It is to be hoped that positive agreement may be reached.

But the pressing need for a treaty must be subordinated to considerations of national security. Every proposal advanced by ourselves or others, every gesture to improve the climate of negotiation must be tested against the standard of adequacy and safety. And it is only with a vast fund of technical information readily available that our negotiators can participate intelligently in these discussions. And, furthermore, it is only with such information that the President and the Congress can determine the proposals which jeopardize our security or promote it. The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency was created to supply this very need, to consolidate and coordinate our research in this field with the demands of international negotiation in mind. The House recognized this need when it passed the original act creating the Agency by the impressive, bipartisan

vote of 290 to 54. I am proud to say that I was one of the original sponsors of that act.

As the Agency continues its work we may discover some useful byproducts developing. For the information which the Agency can provide will furnish both the Congress and the public with the basis on which to draw conclusions about the adequacy of the final agreements. With such information available, the public will be able to separate the question of adequacy of the arrangement from that of the desirability of any arrangement. It is the confusion of these two questions which has put public discussion of a test ban treaty on the level of a numbers game and has forestalled informed debate.

The bill I am introducing would also modify somewhat the security clearance for contractor personnel so as to facilitate the research program by avoiding duplication of effort in making investigations. The proposal would not change the existing standards or procedures for Agency personnel, but would put contractor personnel clearance on a parity with those of other highly sensitive Government agencies. The procedures authorized are common to the Department of Defense and the Central Intelligence Agency. The Congress in 1961 permitted the Atomic Energy Commission to so simplify their procedures.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this legislation as overwhelmingly as they supported the passage of the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in 1961.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, once again in 1963 the city of Buffalo has proclaimed the third week in July as "Captive Nations Week." Appropriate events have been scheduled during the week July 14-21.

Our observance began last Sunday with prayers and religious ceremonies in western New York churches. On the same afternoon, a parade and motorcade proceeded through the streets of downtown Buffalo, gathering in front of our majestic city hall. Here, civic recognition was given to Captive Nations Week in the shadow of the William McKinley Monument.

The Reverend Porter W. Phillips, Erie County Council of Churches secretary, gave an invocation. President Henry J. Osinski of the Central Council of Polish Organizations, acting as toastmaster, introduced Dr. Nestor Procyk, chairman of the citizens committee to observe Captive Nations Week, who gave an address of warm welcome. Dr. Procyk also expressed gratitude to all parade participants, to the mass media for their complete coverage, and to many individuals who had aided in preparing the program.

Mayor Chester Kowal then presented his message and a proclamation:

When our forefathers envisioned the founding of our great Nation they were motivated by great ideals and hoped for a peaceful world in which justice would govern the future of all nations and mankind. Their foresight, sacrifice, hard work, perseverance, and heroism brought forth a nation, which, although young, as history is measured, is second to none in the guarantees of freedom, individual liberty, and the right of family happiness. The labors of the Founding Fathers, their deep philosophy set forth in the documents of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution form a monumental asset in the annals of Western civilization.

Since the founding years, the United States has guarded these inalienable rights for our people and all others. The United States has opened her heart and gates to the teeming masses of the persecuted and unwanted of other lands granting them a chance to a dignified life as guaranteed by the laws of our land. America has always been a staunch defender of human rights, making heavy sacrifices in human life to preserve in other far-off lands those same human rights which are the cornerstone of our great United States. Many of America's sons and daughters have made the supreme sacrifice in distant lands. Those sacrifices were made because we know that a world half free and half slave cannot survive.

Notwithstanding these great sacrifices, the world again is confronted with a mortal challenge. A highly organized tyranny, void of any signs of morals and human dignity, looms threateningly on the horizon. America is leading the family of nations in a total and deadly encounter with this menace. The Soviet Union, this vast prison of nations, is now endangering our very existence.

The desire and fervent aspirations of the peoples in the captive nations for freedom and national independence provides a powerful third force in the war launched by imperial Russia. This third force is bound to our political conviction by an unbreakable bond of ideals—just as it stands as a formidable and unyielding enemy of imperial Russia. We must learn to use this powerful third force for peace, for justice among nations, and for a new world order based upon universal freedom and social righteousness.

The week of July 14 through 21, 1963, is set aside by an act of Congress and by Presidential proclamation as Captive Nations Week. Through this weeklong observance we are reminded of the blessings which we enjoy as a free people and the commitment of our Nation, under God, to advance the frontiers of freedom until tyranny and despotism have vanished from the earth.

As mayor of Buffalo, I welcome this opportunity to advance the cause of peace with justice and I urge and invite all my fellow citizens to join in the activities arranged for this annual observance of Captive Nations Week.

#### PROCLAMATION

Whereas our Nation was founded and built on the precept of freedom and liberty for its citizens who hailed from all parts of the world and sought on these shores a haven for a free life, free worship, and free speech; and

Whereas our Nation, since its inception, has continuously advocated and supported the natural aspirations of other peoples and nations toward self-determination and national independence; and

Whereas our great Nation has demonstrated time and again its readiness to defend these ideals, bringing countless sacrifices in human life, as well as material values, to defend these inalienable rights; and

Whereas our Nation is facing today its greatest challenge and crisis of history by an opposing ideology based on tyranny and despotism which has no equal in history, Russian Communist imperialism; and

Whereas, after the brutal suppression by Russia of the once free and independent peoples of Albania, Armenia, Bulgaria, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, China, Croatia, Slovenia, Serbia, Poland, Ukraine, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, East Germany, Cossackia, Cuba, Tibet, Turkestan, North Vietnam, Czechoslovakia, Byelorussia, Rumania, Hungary, and others; and

Whereas, since the enactment in 1959 of Public Law 86-90, the American people have fittingly demonstrated to victims of Russian aggression that we, the American people, realize their plight and support the just aspirations of the captive nations to a free and independent life; and

Whereas the alliance of the free world with the captive nations constitutes a powerful deterrent to war and holds the key to peace, as the captive nations are the Achilles heel of the Russian empire and their restive masses have doubtlessly hampered and prevented many aggressive designs of imperial Russia; and

Whereas it is imperative that we Americans keep the torch of freedom burning in the hearts and minds of the peoples in the captive nations by showing our deep concern to their present plight and their future by strengthening their resolve to win human dignity, freedom, and national independence;

Now, therefore, I, Chester Kowal, mayor of the city of Buffalo, do hereby proclaim the week of July 14 through 21, 1963, as "Captive Nations Week" and urge the people of our city to observe this week as days of rededication to the cause of liberty and the dignity of man with prayers and public ceremonies, demonstrating our moral support for the just aspirations of the peoples of all the captive nations.

Mr. Speaker, I had the honor of giving the afternoon's principal address:

#### FIFTH OBSERVANCE OF CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

My friends, this week Americans across the country will be observing Captive Nations Week. July 14-21 will be the fifth such observance. Since 1959, when the 86th Congress passed the Captive Nations Week resolution, the activities of the annual observance have grown in scope and depth. From the President, the Governors of our States, and the mayors of our cities, proclamations are issued based on the resolution, urging our citizens to devote themselves anew to the emancipation and freedom of all captive nations. Major cities such as New York, Chicago, and Buffalo have made the week an official, citywide observance, and many others are following suit.

While Captive Nations Week has become a firm American institution, it has also been a huge bone in Khrushchev's throat. We cannot ever forget the vehement reaction on the part of the Russian dictator to Congress passage of the resolution in July 1959. For months thereafter Khrushchev denounced Public Law 86-90. Every year Moscow and its puppets decry the observance, and only this past January 23, the New Times, the Soviet Russian weekly, declared: "Is it not high time to discontinue the 'Captive Nations Week' in the United States? That is just as much a dead horse as the 'Hungarian Question.'"

There is nothing that Khrushchev desires more at this time than the complete acquiescence of the United States and the free world to the permanent captivity of the nations of Central Europe, the U.S.S.R., and Asia. Captive Nations Week and all that each observance produces in thought and discussion regarding America's positive role in the cold war is a major impediment to Moscow's goal.



The resolution itself is a permanent portrait—a mirror if you will—of the Soviet Russian colonial empire which Moscow and its puppets seek to conceal from the world at large.

I feel certain the American people will never bow to Moscow's empire. Nor will they buy the currently peddled notion that for a dubious peace we must accommodate Khrushchev and his colonial empire. On the contrary, during this fifth observance of Captive Nations Week, the American people will respond to the theme of the week: "Liberate Cuba—Restore the Faith in All Captive Nations—Win the Cold War." All the captive nations constitute a strategic weapon for us in the cold war. To ignore or to neglect them would mean discarding this basic weapon to the manifest benefit of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism.

We have an obligation to the men and women and children of the captive nations, I believe, that requires steady support and a firm devotion to a tradition that is a permanent part of the American system—a love of freedom.

These peoples will be liberated from the grasp of imperialism. They will regain their status, and we shall play a leading part in it.

We must show patience and courage and determination. We must recognize that no subject, captive peoples held gripped by puppet rulers who are traitors to their own land, must ever be abandoned as hopelessly Communist, hopelessly lost.

Time is on our side. Time is on the side of those who fight for freedom and have the courage to persevere.

Mr. Speaker, the Sunday ceremonies were concluded with benediction by Msgr. Stanley A. Kulpinski.

Other events this week included a civic luncheon on Wednesday, July 17, sponsored by the Kiwanis Club of Buffalo. Also planned is a captive nations festival and pageant under the stars on Sunday, July 21, in Buffalo's Delaware Park. This festival should provide a fitting conclusion to the week's solemn recognition of the captive nations, as well as a reminder of freedom's unfinished battle against Communist tyranny.

#### IS PRESIDENT KENNEDY'S OPTIMISM ON MOSCOW TEST BAN NEGOTIATIONS WARRANTED?

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has the peculiar ability to be singularly optimistic even when he stands midst the ruins of the failures of his many policies. His attitude toward the present negotiations with the Soviet Union for a test ban agreement is no exception. In his press conference yesterday the President seemed extremely happy with the negotiations and optimistic about the results.

Of course, he did not tell the press nor the American people what is actually being negotiated. He did not say whether or not that an agreement, in fact, has already been reached and the present conference is merely window dressing to soften up Congress and the Nation to accept the final draft. It is

just a little suspicious when Communist Dictator Khrushchev does such a sudden aboutface in wanting to reach an agreement with the free world and when he greets with such enthusiasm the arrival of Averell Harriman, the President's negotiator. Are we sure he was only joking when he opened the conference with an invitation to sign first and work out the details later?

I do not want to be unfair to the efforts of President Kennedy, but there is so much evidence of secret deals with the Soviet Union over Cuba and other areas, that the American people just cannot afford to be easy about the Moscow-Harriman meeting and President Kennedy's assurance that all will be well.

My uneasiness is increased by recent statements of Dr. Edward Teller who said:

It is my conviction that today the Russians are ahead of us in nuclear explosives. I cannot prove this statement, but I will say to you categorically that no one can prove its opposite.

With even the slightest indication that Russia is leading the United States in the development of nuclear explosives, how can anyone in this country be optimistic about a test ban agreement which will bind us because we honor our agreements, but will have no effect upon the activities of the Soviet Union because history proves they do not.

Further, I want to point out several other pertinent statements by Dr. Teller who said he believes that the Russians may be close to developing an anti-missile missile. If they succeed, or if they can make us believe they are about to succeed and we have not developed such a weapon, then we have no defenses.

Dr. Teller says:

In order to develop missile defenses one needs to test in the atmosphere, but one does not need big tests. No one, in or out of the disarmament agency has claimed that nuclear explosives under 1 kiloton, in the atmosphere, can be detected. With experiments using small explosives missile advances can be conducted. These small explosions, made by the Russians, may seal our doom.

There are two conclusions. We cannot detect their testing and we must continue our testing.

In view of these convictions of one of the world's greatest scientists, how can President Kennedy be optimistic about a test ban agreement? Does he believe the American people are stupid and that they will accept his word as a guarantee for our future security? In view of the long record of broken agreements, betrayals, and the duplicity of every Communist leader since Lenin, including the present jovial Khrushchev, how can President Kennedy dare ask the American people to trust the Russians when the very life of our Nation is at stake?

In addition to the stark reality of the danger of entering into such an agreement with the Soviet Union there is the gnawing suspicion that soon we are going to be asked to make further concessions for a permanently divided Germany, recognition of the Soviet satellite, Cuba, and a nonaggression pact which will allow the Communists to solidify their territorial gains and freeze the activity

of any free people to remain free or any people now enslaved by the Communists to regain their freedom. Such suspicion is not confined to a few of us in Congress, or a few knowledgeable people in the United States; it is being frankly discussed by our allies in Europe and is the main reason for the present distrust of the United States in being either willing or ready to defend itself or its allies against the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, President Kennedy has shown a remarkable lack of understanding of communism and the threat to world peace of Communist imperialism. Because of this, there is every reason to believe that he and those who are advising him are not capable of protecting the security of the United States through any test ban agreement with the Soviet Union.

Even the Washington Post, a newspaper which certainly cannot be declared unfriendly to President Kennedy, closes its news article this morning on the President's news conference with this frank paragraph:

If the Soviet Union—with the help of the United States and Britain—can get their names on the dotted line of partial test ban agreement, that would be a political coup in support of the Soviet version of peaceful co-existence and a major blow to Red China.

Mr. President, I ask you to tell the American people if Mr. Harriman is now in Moscow to protect the future security of the American people or the Communist dictatorship of Premier Khrushchev?

#### CHAMIZAL

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is believed that this evening President Kennedy will release an announcement that part of the United States of America is being turned over to Mexico, the Chamizal area.

The State Department's Chamizal negotiations with Mexico is a matter that has been under consideration by various administrations for many years. The proposed Chamizal settlement which includes the exchange of certain lands of the Chamizal area and of Cordova Island, was initiated by the Kennedy administration over 1½ years ago. Most of the details and commitments involved in this exchange were worked out prior to my taking office as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

The proposed settlement would involve the relocation of the Rio Grande at El Paso, Tex., and an exchange of territory resulting in the net transfer to Mexico of 437 acres of land located in the city of El Paso. The northern half of Cordova Island—193 acres—would be transferred to the United States. State Department officials advised me, "a fair and reasonable market value will be paid to the approximately 3,750 residents and business people for their land and build-

ings." The value of the property is estimated at \$20 million, of which \$5 million is for buildings and the remainder for land. The cost of relocating U.S. railroads is estimated at \$2 million. The two governments would supposedly share the cost of relocating the river and constructing a new channel, of which \$2.5 million would be paid by the United States. There would be a total estimated immediate cost of \$25 million to the United States.

In return, a Mexican bank is to reimburse the United States approximately \$4.7 million for the improvements on the land. The 193 acres of Cordova Island to be transferred to the United States has an estimated value of \$3.2 to \$6 million, depending upon the use and method of disposal. Therefore, after deducting the payment for the improvements and the value of the new land acquired, the total overall cost to the United States would be about \$18 million.

Personally, I have seriously questioned the advisability of giving this land, which has been in our peaceful possession for over 100 years, to Mexico. According to my interpretation of the law and of past treaties and decisions, this property legally belongs to the United States and giving it away will not enhance the respect of our country in the eyes of the Mexican Government or the people of the world. However, the House of Representatives does not act upon the convention or treaty that could agree to the terms of the Chamizal proposal. This decision would be made by the United States Senate.

Since this decision will not be up to the House of Representatives, I believe that one of my very important responsibilities is to look out for, and protect, the best interests of the people I represent. In the event of an agreement, I will exert every influence of my office to see that my people are treated fairly, receive a justified settlement value for their property and that they are properly reimbursed for the costs and inconveniences to which they will be subjected, including the costs of moving to new locations. You can be assured that I will continue to try, to the best of my ability, to represent the considered opinions and feelings of the folks of west Texas.

#### MODERATE COST HOUSING NEEDED

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, the steadily rising cost of housing a family presents increasing difficulties in supplying middle income housing. A very real gap persists in this segment of the private housing market.

One effective answer to this problem is the relatively recent development of cooperative housing projects. The growing shortage of usable land which is

reasonably accessible to centers of employment makes desirable the concentration of more housing in multifamily structures.

Cooperatives combine multifamily dwellings with the added advantage of private individual ownership, and at the same time provide more economical shelter. Lower maintenance and operating costs as well as Federal income tax benefits make it possible that cooperatives are financed under section 213 of the National Housing Act. This results in monthly savings of 20 to 25 percent for middle income families.

The legislation I am introducing today is aimed at strengthening, promoting, and improving the cooperative housing program. Through this legislation more Americans will enjoy benefits under existing laws. The purpose of this bill allows cooperatives the opportunity to reduce their fixed housing costs by putting the Federal Housing Administration insurance fund on a mutual basis. By such reduction the operation of the fund would make cooperatives reap the benefits of far greater stability.

#### INSURANCE SAVINGS

Furthermore, surpluses which accrue in the cooperative insurance fund would be distributed to participating cooperative mortgagors in accordance with sound actuarial and accounting practices. Any such savings would then be passed on to the occupant members of the cooperatives in the form of lower monthly carrying charges.

The change proposed by this bill is a small one, nevertheless it can have impact on the housing market since even a small reduction in monthly carrying charges can enlarge the market for such housing. Moreover, the prospect of lower costs will further stimulate the development of additional cooperative housing projects.

#### STRUGGLE AGAINST SLUMS

Cooperatives have proved a valuable addition to the urban housing scene. They are one of the best weapons we have in the struggle against blight and slum conditions. Cooperatives have a particularly vital role in the urban redevelopment movement because of their unique contribution in supplying suitable housing within the financial budget of many city workers.

#### STABLE NEIGHBORHOODS

Cooperatives also help exert a beneficial stabilizing influence on their respective communities. This is true because cooperative housing occupancy has proved to reduce turnover significantly and has created more permanent and stable neighborhoods. Pride of ownership has been a spur to the growth of cooperatives.

The Federal Housing Administration section 213 program is a success. The amendments I have offered to the cooperative housing program should give impetus to this important program by encouraging it to play an even bigger role in urban housing and redevelopment plans in America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge prompt consideration of this bill.

#### "WHAT GOES ON?"

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RUMSFELD. Mr. Speaker, the press in recent weeks has contained periodic reference to the continuing personal correspondence between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. It is my understanding that more than 40 letters have been exchanged between these two individuals. As many Members of Congress, and interested and concerned Americans, I feel that the President has a responsibility to keep the American people advised of developments in the cold war. Very simply the President owes us some facts.

In this connection it should be recalled that the personal exchanges between President Franklin Roosevelt and Premier Stalin have still not been made public. Events in the world today move rapidly. In a dictatorship such secrecy would be expected. In a democracy, it cannot be accepted.

Mr. Speaker, an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of July 8, 1963, entitled "What Goes On?" follows:

#### WHAT GOES ON?

Marquis Childs recently wrote that there is a "continuing personal correspondence" between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev.

Is there any other basis on which the apparent softening of Washington's attitude toward Castro Cuba could be explained?

We, like most Americans, are largely in the dark and we would like to know more about what goes on.

Fragments of evidence, all too incomplete, suggest that Washington is impressed with Mr. Castro's latest gestures toward easing tensions. "U.S. officials," reports the New York Times from Washington, "who have been analyzing Mr. Castro's offers to 'normalize' relations believe they are motivated by a genuine desire to relieve external pressures on his regime at a time when it must concentrate on solving pressing economic difficulties."

"Similar observations were made by Latin-American diplomats who recently returned from Cuba. They said that Mr. Castro had personally assured the Governments of Brazil and Mexico that he would abandon his campaign to subvert the Latin-American nations."

"Personally assured."

What goes on?

The OAS Council has just voted a mild resolution to curb travel to Cuba and to tighten inter-American security measures. But this reportedly replaced a stronger resolution. The United States is not now pressing for an economic embargo as it earlier said it would.

Why? Is it because of the supposed easing of Castro's militance? Is there a change of American policy despite the usual denials? Or has Washington been unable to persuade Britain and other European countries to stop trading with Cuba (their trade has been sharply increasing in recent months), and cannot therefore request their Western Hemisphere allies to cut their trade merely to have the Europeans take it over?

Mr. Castro's present mildness could, conceivably be part of an important new gambit of the Soviet bloc which Mr. Kennedy knows



about because of his letters from Mr. Khrushchev. But it could be tactical, too. Mr. Castro would have ample precedent for smiling while Soviet and western traders replenish his economic larders, only to turn on the Americas with renewed strength and aggression later on.

These are surmises and Mr. Kennedy owes us some facts.

### CAPTIVE NATIONS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Flood] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include extraneous material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, as I was rereading President Kennedy's recent statements in Europe, I could not help noticing his repeated references to self-determination of peoples.

The central issue is—

The President said in his address before the Irish Parliament—

between those who believe in self-determination and those in the East who impose upon others the harsh and repressive Communist system.

The President was visibly moved by what he saw in Berlin. Everyone living in that divided city can be proud of being a Berliner, he told them. Moreover, he urged those who suffer beyond that wall as well as those enduring endless years of oppression not to despair of their future. He offered them the example of the Irish, who had shown constancy, faith, and endurance during the long struggle for independence, finally culminating in success.

While urging the Berliners not to despair, the President saw favorable signs on the horizon. History was running against the Marxist dogma, the Jeffersonian philosophy of freedom was spreading, the winds of change were blowing across the Iron Curtain as well as in the rest of the world.

It is not too early to think, once again in terms of all Europe.

The President remarked, that is, of a united Europe, where no Iron Curtain splits the German nation in two parts and separates Poland, Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Albania from the rest of the European community.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to take strong exception to the Russian Premier and some of our columnists who claim that the President had spoken two different languages at the American University and in Europe. To be sure, at the American University he spoke of the reassessment of our own views on the cold war and of accommodation. However, he also stressed his endeavor to convince Russia that she too could let each nation choose its own future. In elaborating on the same address in Bonn, the President stressed that what he meant was "we cannot accept with

equanimity, nor do we propose to, the Communist takeover of countries—we will not accept the subversion or an attack on a free country—for we accept the principle of self-determination.

Hence, what the President meant when he spoke of accommodation did not imply the recognition of the status quo. Nor did it imply accommodation at the expense of other countries. "We will not bargain one nation's interest against another's," the President assured the free and the captive nations alike in his speech in Frankfurt.

Barely returned from his trip to Europe, President Kennedy put his signature on the Captive Nations Week proclamation, in which he said that the cause of human rights and dignity remained a universal aspiration, that justice required the elemental rights, and that this Nation had an abiding commitment to the principles of national self-determination and human freedom. And he concluded the proclamation by urging the American people to pledge renewed devotion to the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty.

In issuing the proclamation on the morrow of the memorable date, on which our own Nation achieved its freedom and independence, the President not only referred to the great principles in which our Nation so strongly believes; he also was moved by the argument, so succinctly expressed in Public Law 86-90, that the captive nations constitute a powerful deterrent to war and one of the best hopes for a just and lasting peace. "We need your freedom to protect ours," the President pointed out in Frankfurt. Needless to say how much better would we be protected if all captive nations enumerated in Public Law 86-90 were free today.

The renewal of our devotion to the just aspirations of all people, made on the heels of President Kennedy's assurances in Europe, that the captive nations will not be abandoned, his urging not to despair, and his belief in the dawn of freedom could but uplift the spirit of the captive nations. What I cannot understand, Mr. Speaker, is the endeavor of our Government agencies to undermine his policy, the same policy he has been enunciating since the very beginning of his administration at various places, at various times, on various occasions. Let the facts speak.

It so happens that the issuance of the Presidential Proclamation on Captive Nations Week coincides with the severe curtailment of all exile activities in this country. A heavy axe has fallen across the board. Cuban, Russian, Baltic, and central European exiles have been affected. Their organizations have been left with very low funds. As a result, they had to curtail their information activities. The scholarly Baltic Review and Rivista Baltica have put out their last issues. The monitoring of Soviet broadcasts in the Baltic languages will have to stop soon. The personnel of the various exile committees has been ordered to be cut down to the bone. Their pay has been reduced below the subsistence level. The Baltic Hall in New

York, which had for years served as the center for various useful exile programs, had to close its doors.

The curtailment of exile broadcasting activities promises to be just as drastic. It is my understanding that the Baltic exile organizations will have no funds for broadcasts over Radio Madrid and Radio Roma as of September 1. Their appeal to institute broadcasts in the Baltic languages over Radio Free Europe has been disapproved by the State Department. A reply to that effect, addressed to the Joint Baltic American Committee, dated April 22, 1963, and signed by Mr. Richard H. Davis, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State, said:

American efforts in the field of broadcasting to the Baltic States have in the past been purposely concentrated in the Voice of America. The parties concerned have felt that this was the best course, and no new factors have entered into the situation to change this view.

If Mr. Davis' reference to the parties concerned applies to the Free Europe Committee, which operates Radio Free Europe, then he must have failed to check with the parties concerned before replying on their behalf. For Mr. John Richardson, Jr., chairman of the Free Europe Committee, in reply to the Baltic appeal, had assured them on February 19, 1963, that he would give support to the request and endeavor to secure the necessary funds. Mr. Richardson proved consistent in this view. Testifying before a House Foreign Affairs Committee a year ago, on June 12, 1962, he said that the only reason for not including the Baltic countries in the Radio Free Europe program was a financial one.

The State Department's negative attitude toward the expansion of exile information activities doomed the Baltic appeal. After shutting off the Baltic broadcasts over Radio Madrid and Radio Roma, Voice of America will remain the only source of Baltic broadcasts beamed behind the Iron Curtain. Yet we all know that VOA's programs have become so sterile, so dispirited, so empty that even the Russians no longer bother jamming them.

To be sure, the State Department claims that Radio Free Europe is a privately sponsored organization as are other exile organizations and their programs and activities. This view has been stressed in Mr. Davis' reply I just cited as well as in a letter Mr. Frederick Dutton, Assistant Secretary of State, addressed to me on May 20, 1963. However, while disclaiming the Department's official relationship with the exile organizations or its involvement in their financial support, Mr. Dutton admitted that the Department was "very much aware of them, and was following their activities with close interest."

It is, therefore, inconceivable to me that the curtailment of exile activities could have taken place without the State Department's endorsement and/or direction. The fact that the Free Europe Committee no longer speaks of instituting Baltic broadcasts over Radio Free Europe, in contrast to its earlier sympathetic attitude, is a good illustration of the pressure that could have been generated by the Department.

Claiming that the State Department is not involved in financing any of the exile activities, Mr. Dutton admitted that such activities were being reviewed in order to make them more effective in relation to the resources devoted to them. In plain English, this means stretching the meager funds available for such activities. As we have seen, no stretching has helped to avert a drastic curtailment of information services, let alone personal hardships.

Are the exile activities useful? Mr. Dutton gave the answer when he said that the exiles had carried on a number of useful activities over the years and we continue to think that there are fields in which they can do valuable work in the future.

If we are giving aid to the so-called nonaligned countries and to the Russian satellites in exchange for their abstention votes in the United Nations or even in disregard of their continuous voting with Moscow, why should we not give comfort to the captive nations, our true friends? Public Law 86-90 not only recognized them as our true friends; it also stressed that it was vital to the national security of the United States that their desire for liberty and independence should be steadfastly kept alive. How can we keep it alive if we deprive their brethren in our country of an opportunity to speak to the captive nations in their own languages and to constantly remind us and the rest of the free world of their plight?

Mr. Speaker, every year the State Department has been bringing its heavy guns up to the Hill in quest of appropriation of hundreds of millions—not thousands—of dollars for the nonaligned nations, Russian satellites, and assorted dictatorships. Yet never did the State Department spokesmen request even a modest appropriation to support exile activities which they found useful in the past and promising in the future. In this respect the Department had treated our friends worse than our foreshorn enemies of the fence sitters.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that none of the congressional committees have ever looked into the flagrant discrepancy between our assurances and promises to the captive nations and our deeds. I am not surprised, however, for we do not have a committee that would take the plight of the captive nations in its heart. Judging from past experiences, no change in this attitude can be expected as long as we do not have a Special Committee on Captive Nations I and many of my distinguished colleagues have advocated for years.

Only the Special Committee on Captive Nations could ask our Government agencies why they are spending taxpayers' money on studies that praise the Soviet Union for the enslavement of hundreds of millions of people. I am referring to the ill-conceived two-volume study, "Quis Custodiet?" It was completed this last April by the Peace Research Institute under a grant of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

This is a collaborative study, prepared by more than half a dozen researchers. One of them, Mr. Walter Millis, director

of the Study of War as an Institution, Center for the Study of Democratic Institutions, Fund for the Republic, had this to say on page A14:

Whether we admit it to ourselves or not, we benefit enormously from the capability of the Soviet police system to keep law and order over the 200-million-odd Russians and the many additional millions in the satellite states. The breakup of the Russian Communist empire today would doubtless be conducive to freedom, but would be a good deal more catastrophic for the world than was the breakup of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in 1918.

Mr. Speaker, I expect to read such glorifications of the dreaded Soviet police system in a Communist or pro-Communist tract; I never expected to find it in a study financed by our Government agencies. When I say "agencies" I mean it.

For the Department of Defense, through its representative, Col. Harold Aarons, also "observed part of the study process"—page 3. To be sure, the statements contained in the "Quis Custodiet?" report proved so controversial that the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency hastily pasted a label on the study stating:

The judgments expressed in the report are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Agency or any other department or agency of the U.S. Government.

The hastily pasted-on label means that the Government agencies disagree with Mr. Millis' assertion that there are 200-million-odd Russians over which Soviet police keep law and order. Mr. Millis is not as illiterate as to be ignorant of the fact that the Russian Communist Empire—to use his own terminology—does not contain 200-million-odd Russians. He knows perfectly well that their number is only half as large and that the other half is composed of the Russian-enslaved nations. Nevertheless, he resorts to a deliberate deception of the users of his study and of his contractor.

The Arms Control and Disarmament Agency-financed report further advocates the preservation of the Russian Communist Empire. The admirer of the Soviet police system, Mr. Millis, bluntly declares on pages A14-A15 that, in a completely policed world, the Hungarian revolution or something similar on a larger scale would be suppressed with all the forces of law and order—that is, including the United States—cooperating in the suppression. As for a completely policed world, with no national armies left and no power possessing nuclear weapons, this is a utopian figment of the imagination of Mr. Millis and his likes.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the captive nations will never learn of the proposals contained in a study that was financed or monitored by two of our Government agencies, or that they will believe it was a fantasy of a group of irresponsible researchers. However, what I would like the future Special Committee on Captive Nations to do is to look behind this and other similar studies, which completely disregard our

commitments to the captive nations, our solemn assurances, and our dedication to the same principles that are anchored in our own Declaration of Independence.

My resolution to establish a Special Committee on Captive Nations, that was introduced in the 87th Congress, has been gathering dust in the Rules Committee for many, many months without any action being taken. What would be more fitting than to vote favorably on it and then enact it during this Captive Nations Week?

Mr. Speaker, I request your support for House Resolution 14.

#### A NUCLEAR TEST BAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] is recognized for 2 hours.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, this last Monday, July 15, 1963, Gov. W. Averell Harriman began his meetings in Moscow with Premier Khrushchev and Lord Hailsham of England, the purpose—to discuss a nuclear test ban.

Mr. Speaker, the good wishes and prayers of all men of good will accompany Governor Harriman. There is change in the air—and hope, for Governor Harriman journeys to Moscow at a moment in modern history when our relations with the Soviets can be said to be improved.

Governor Harriman's assignment can truly be said to be bipartisan in purpose, for the aims of his mission are in accordance with both the Republican and Democratic platforms as presented to the people of the United States and the world in 1960.

I quote from the Republican Party platform:

We are similarly ready to negotiate and to institute realistic methods and safeguards for disarmament, and for the suspension of nuclear tests. We advocate an early agreement by all nations to forgo nuclear tests in the atmosphere, and the suspension of other tests as verification techniques permit \* \* \*. We have deep concern about the nuclear arms race. This concern leads us to seek disarmament and nuclear agreements.

And the Democratic Party platform proposes a similar program, as follows:

There are no simple solutions to the infinitely complex challenges which face us. Mankind's eternal dream, a world of peace, can only be built slowly and patiently.

A primary task is to develop responsible proposals that will help break the deadlock on arms control.

Such proposals should include means for ending nuclear tests under workable safeguards, cutting back nuclear weapons.

In President Kennedy's recent commencement address at American University he not only announced that the United States would refrain from conducting further atmospheric nuclear tests unless other nations conducted them, he also called for a basic reexamination of our attitudes toward our adversaries and toward the pursuit of peace.

Mr. Speaker, as President Kennedy pointed out:

In the final analysis, our most basic common link is that we all inhabit this planet.



We all breathe the same air. We all cherish our children's future. And we are all mortal.

One of our big problems is that we tend to forget that there are people on the other side. We have only to read the news dispatches from Moscow and Peiping to know that the Communists do not all agree with each other. Splits have occurred in the Communist bloc which could have the most far reaching consequences. The Russians disagree with the Chinese, the Chinese disagree with the Yugoslavs, the Yugoslavs disagree with the Albanians, the Albanians disagree with the Poles, and so on. A struggle for leadership is continuing within Communist parties throughout the world. Internal conflicts wrack the Communist world.

Something else is happening in the Communist world. New generations are rising. The industrialized Communist regimes are undergoing fresh change. As the late Secretary of State John Foster Dulles said in 1958:

There is nothing inevitable about communism except that it, too, is bound to change. The forces that change it are already at work and discernible.

In that same year of 1958, an American industrialist who became a distinguished public servant for the United States and then the United Nations pointed to these changes in the Soviet Union and suggested a new approach for our foreign policy. Paul Hoffman, writing in *Look* magazine, observed:

The very success of the Soviet Union in mastering a complex industrial system, its haste in training hundreds of thousands of teachers, scientists, engineers, and administrators, have created a new class of men in Russia, outside and apart from the power bureaucracy—but dominated by it. These men are our potential allies, whether they realize it or not, because they want what we want too—tranquility to pursue their careers and improve their standards of living. Above all, because they are intelligent, they crave dignity: and since dignity comes only with freedom, a conflict of interest must always exist between them and their power bureaucracy. These new men in Russia are growing rapidly in number and prestige. Our problem is to get to them, and, through them, to their masters.

Since then we have seen that the men described by Paul Hoffman have been the ones with whom their counterparts in the West have established the easiest rapport. Soviet and American scientists have met at a series of pugwash conferences and elsewhere, and have discovered that they often see eye-to-eye. But we are not sure that we have been able, in the words of Paul Hoffman, to "get through them, to their masters." We have also witnessed a struggle by another group in Soviet society, the artists and intellectuals, against the power bureaucracy. Here, again, is a group which craves dignity and the freedom to pursue their careers in their own way. They have a tough existence, but is their battle not the battle of all men who want freedom? Is their battle not part of the same struggle, at home and abroad, for elementary human rights?

In his speech at American University, President Kennedy put his finger on this human factor. He said:

No government or social system is so evil that its people must be considered as lacking in virtue. As Americans, we find communism profoundly repugnant as a negation of personal freedom and dignity. But we can still hail the Russian people for their many achievements—in science and space, in economic and industrial growth, in culture, in acts of courage.

The late Pope John XXIII, in his magnificent encyclical "Peace on Earth," made essentially the same point when he suggested:

One must never confuse error and the person who errs, not even when there is question of error or inadequate knowledge of truth in the moral or religious field. The person who errs is always and above all a human being and retains in every case his dignity as a human person.

And so, Mr. Speaker, it is with some degree of hope and expectation that we await the outcome of the Moscow discussions. We know that time is running out. In a few short years there may be 15 or 20 nuclear powers. With this in the future we must bend every effort now to build the foundation for a peaceful world where the ideological differences and disagreements between nations can be resolved not by war but rather under international law and through economic and political competition.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California for bringing this issue before the House at this significant time. I say significant because news stories from Moscow indicate that we may be on the eve of an historical development. Negotiators from the United States, led by Under Secretary of State Averell Harriman, from the Soviet Union, and from Great Britain, have already begun to draft language for a treaty to end nuclear tests in the air, under water, and in outer space. Although Mr. Harriman's mission was supposed to be largely exploratory, progress is already being made in putting a treaty together.

Some of us have watched the nuclear test ban talks for the past 5 years, hoping that the obstacles could be overcome. During that time four nations have tested nuclear weapons in the atmosphere, a situation which has damaged the health and probably some of the lives of generations now living and as yet unborn. Just recently I have been led by this situation to join Senator WILLIAM PROXMIRE in introducing bills which would provide more adequate countermeasures against the pollution of our environment from radioactive fallout. In a real sense we are now paying a high price—in terms of cancer, leukemia, and genetic damage—for participation in the arms race. Some individuals point to the small percentage of our population which might be affected by fallout damage and conclude that the price is not too high. I would remind

these individuals, Mr. Speaker, that we are tampering with the lives of people. This is a moral issue of the most agonizing kind.

A nuclear test ban treaty is not an end in itself. It is a beginning—a sensible beginning of the search for ways to settle international disputes without the weapons of modern warfare.

Mr. Speaker, it has been apparent for several years to some of us that this country's security cannot forever be protected by H-bombs and intercontinental ballistic missiles. Other nations will gain these weapons of mass destruction unless we find the means to achieve mutual disarmament. That is why I have repeatedly expressed my concern and joined as an original sponsor of the bill to create the present Arms Control and Disarmament Agency. That is why I am proud to have cosponsored legislation in this session to give the Agency permanent status. I am sure we do not have all the answers to the problem of world security, but I am prepared to say that this Nation can and should spend more time and effort and money to find the answers. If we do not, I see little hope that we will survive the 1970's.

That is why a nuclear test ban treaty would be a hopeful beginning. Such an agreement must provide a base on which further accords in the field of arms control and disarmament can be built, and in which some of the long-smoldering disputes can be resolved. We know that disarmament is not enough—we must also strengthen the United Nations to help contain future conflicts—but disarmament of all countries is one of the main roads to our survival.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that the mission to Moscow by Under Secretary of State Harriman has the prayerful support of the vast majority of our citizens. I can testify, on the basis of personal contact with my own constituents, that the issue of a nuclear test ban treaty is one which has generated widespread and continuing interest.

In addition to evidence of this support coming from many sources, I have been pleased to note two statements by religious leaders recently made on behalf of a nuclear test ban agreement. The first is a statement by 45 distinguished American clergymen. The second is the full text of the resolution on nuclear testing approved this month by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ.

The first statement is signed by some of the most eminent church dignitaries in this country, including Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A.; Harry Emerson Fosdick; Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr; the Right Reverend James A. Pike; the Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., and Ralph Sockman. When the risks of a test ban are weighed, these religious leaders say, "It is clear that national and world security lie in an inspected agreement to stop atomic testing."

The second statement, by the General Synod of the United Church of Christ,

is a model not only of a clear statement of position, but also and especially of a call to members of a religious body to put their beliefs into action. The resolution declares that if a test ban treaty is agreed upon by the negotiating powers, and assuming that such treaty will carry safeguards for the security of the United States and of the free world, the Council for Christian Social Action is authorized and requested, by communications to our churches and by testimony in the U.S. Senate, to work for its favorable consideration by the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the full text of these statements so that my colleagues may reflect on their message:

**TEXT OF STATEMENT BY RELIGIOUS DIGNITARIES  
SUPPORTING A NUCLEAR TEST BAN TREATY**

It now lies in the power of the United States and the Soviet Union to turn back from the danger of nuclear threats which have haunted the world for so many years.

It is now clear to the United States and the Soviet Union that each has the nuclear power to destroy the other many times over, that accident or calculation can devastate the rest of the world.

It is now clear to both that until nuclear testing is stopped, each will compete with the other in greater potential for death.

We who are citizens of the United States bear a responsibility, not only to ourselves but toward mankind, to do everything possible to stop the increase in nuclear arms and the present drift toward war. We now have the opportunity to act. It may be the last opportunity we have before it becomes forever impossible to stop the arms race.

In the name of humanity we therefore call upon the President of the United States to maintain his belief in the necessity of a test ban treaty, to press his efforts to achieve it, and to trust the good sense and the good will of the American people to support his efforts to the hilt.

President Kennedy has told his country and the world that an effective treaty with the Soviet Union to ban all nuclear tests—in all environments—is not only in the best interests of world peace, but in the best interests of the national security of the United States.

We believe him. Without such a treaty, no man is secure, every man in every country can look to the day when the nuclear threat will come home to him.

There are those who say that to ban the tests will give to the Soviets an advantage so great as to imperil our safety.

This we deny.

We do so because the President, after full consultation with his Committee of Principals, including the Secretaries of State and Defense, the heads of the Central Intelligence Agency, the U.S. Disarmament Agency, the Atomic Energy Commission, and his scientific advisers, has rendered a judgment that our national security is enhanced, not diminished, by a test ban treaty with the Soviet Union. We believe that the President must now be supported in his efforts to negotiate such a treaty.

Other concerns have been expressed that without a large number of inspections on Soviet territory we could not guarantee the agreement. But whether the number of inspections should be seven, as the United States has proposed, or three as the U.S.S.R. insists, is surely a matter to be negotiated by the President's representatives in the assurance that whatever number is agreed upon will not be at the expense of American security.

What then are the risks? On the one side, without a treaty there will be more tests by both countries, more and more dangers to the world's people from radioactive fallout, greater increase in nuclear armaments, greater spread of nuclear weapons to other countries, and thus greater possibility of nuclear war.

On the other side, with a treaty, there is the risk of cheating—not in the atmosphere or outer space, where tests can be detected—but underground where occasionally a small nuclear explosion might be masked as an earthquake disturbance. Even here such risk is minimized by the Soviet agreement to permit obligatory on-site inspections of suspicious events, and the distribution of a small number of sealed seismic detectors on Soviet territory, the number of which will have to be negotiated with the United States.

When these risks are weighed, when the President of the United States has declared both his willingness to negotiate and his assurance of our security, it is clear that national and world security lie in an inspected agreement to stop atomic testing.

As Christians and churchmen we call upon our fellow Americans to understand what is at stake, to clarify for themselves the issues involved, and to support their President in his efforts to call a halt to the testing of the most destructive weapons mankind has ever known. We believe that success in such efforts is the first step to world peace and the control of war.

**SIGNATORIES**

Stuart Leroy Anderson, president, Pacific School of Religion, Berkeley, Calif.

Gene E. Bartlett, president, Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N.Y.

The Most Reverend Metropolitan Antony Bashir, archbishop of the Syrian Antiochian Orthodox Archdiocese, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Jerald C. Brauer, dean, Divinity School, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

Frank H. Caldwell, president, Louisville Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

The Very Reverend John B. Coburn, dean, Episcopal Theological School, Cambridge, Mass.

Bishop Fred Pierce Corson, Methodist Bishop of Philadelphia, Philadelphia, Pa.

Robert E. Cushman, dean, Divinity School of Duke University, Durham, N.C.

Edwin T. Dahlberg, former president of National Council of Churches of Christ in the United States of America, minister in residence, Crozer Theological Seminary, Chester, Pa.

Rt. Rev. Horace W. B. Donegan, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, New York, N.Y.

Paul H. Eller, president, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Naperville, Ill.

Rev. Carl B. Eschbach, minister, Fairview Evangelical United Brethren Church, Dayton, Ohio.

Edward C. Fendt, president, Evangelical Lutheran Theological Seminary, Capital University, Columbus, Ohio.

William C. Finch, dean, the Divinity School, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tenn.

Charles W. Forman, acting dean, Divinity School, Yale University, New Haven, Conn.

Harry Emerson Fosdick, Bronxville, N.Y.

James N. Gettemy, president, the Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn.

The Reverend Theodore Alexander Gill, president, San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, Calif.

Bishop A. Raymond Grant, chairman, division of human relations and economic affairs, the Methodist Church, Portland, Oreg.

Rev. Dr. Dana McLean Greeley, president, Unitarian Universalist Association, Boston, Mass.

His Eminence Iakovos, archbishop of the Greek archdiocese of North and South America.

Rt. Rev. Charles J. Kinsolving III, Protestant Episcopal bishop of New Mexico, Santa Fe, N. Mex.

John H. Kromminga, president, Calvin Theological Seminary, Grand Rapids, Mich.

Bishop John Wesley Lord, Methodist bishop of the Washington area, Washington, D.C.

Samuel H. Miller, dean, Divinity School, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

Robert V. Moss, Jr., president, Lancaster Theological Seminary, Lancaster, Pa.

Bishop R. H. Mueller, president, board of bishops, the Evangelical United Brethren, Indianapolis, Ind.

Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, New York, N.Y.

Beauford A. Norris, president, Christian Theological Seminary, Indianapolis, Ind.

Rt. Rev. Austin Pardue, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rt. Rev. James A. Pike, J.S.D., S.T.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of California, San Francisco, Calif.

Bishop Richard C. Raines, bishop of Methodist Church, the Indiana area, Indianapolis, Ind.

Bishop Marshall R. Reed, resident bishop, the Methodist Church, the Michigan area, former presiding bishop, council of bishops, the Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.

Alvin N. Rogness, president, Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.

The Very Reverend Lawrence Rose, dean, the General Theological Seminary, New York, N.Y.

The Very Reverend Francis B. Sayre, Jr., L.H.D., dean, Washington Cathedral, Washington, D.C.

Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of the diocese of western New York, Buffalo, N.Y.

Howard Schomer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.

Rt. Rev. Henry Knox Sherrill, retired Protestant Episcopal bishop, former presiding bishop of the Protestant Episcopal church, and former president of the National Council of Churches of Christ in the U.S.A., Boxford, Mass.

Ralph Sockman, minister emeritus, Christ Church Methodist, New York, N.Y.

Rt. Rev. Anson Phelps Stokes, Jr., Protestant Episcopal bishop of Boston, Boston, Mass.

Bishop Donald Harvey Tippet, Methodist bishop of San Francisco, San Francisco, Calif.

Bishop William J. Walls, secretary board of bishops, African Methodist Episcopal Zion Church, Chicago, Ill.

Bishop Hazen G. Werner, resident bishop, Methodist Church, Ohio area, Columbus, Ohio.

The Very Reverend Richard H. Wilmer, Jr., Ph. D., dean, Berkeley Divinity School, New Haven, Conn.

**RESOLUTION ON NUCLEAR TESTING**

Whereas the second general synod in its "call to Christian action in society" said: "We therefore call upon our churches and their members to pray and work: \* \* \* for effective international control and reduction of all national armaments, including the testing of nuclear weapons," and

Whereas the third general synod in its pronouncement on "national responsibility and international relations" said: "We welcome the increased attention now being given by both Government and private organizations to plan for the reduction, control, and eventual elimination of national armaments. We also urge the United States to persist in the effort to reach multilateral agreement on the cessation of all kinds of nuclear weapons testing"; and



Whereas the Government of the United States is working toward this goal, as evidenced by repeated Presidential statements, by persistence in negotiations with other nuclear powers, by the announced intention to engage in new discussions in Moscow in July of this year, following the failure of the Geneva Conference to reach agreement, and by the decision to conduct no further tests in the atmosphere so long as other States do not do so; and

Whereas, by providing a first step in the reduction and control of armaments, by eliminating future fallout, and by helping to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons, a test ban treaty is in the interests of American security, as well as in the interest of general human well-being: Be it

*Resolved*, That the fourth general synod of the United Church of Christ, meeting in Denver, Colo., July 4-11, 1963, commend and support the continuous and now renewed effort by our Government to reach agreement by the principal nuclear powers on the permanent cessation of nuclear weapons testing; and be it further

*Resolved*, That if a test ban treaty is agreed upon by the negotiating powers, and assuming that such treaty will carry safeguards for the security of the United States and of the free world, the Council for Christian Social Action is authorized and requested, by communications to our churches and by testimony in the U.S. Senate, to work for its favorable consideration by the Senate.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from New York for his most excellent remarks.

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Hawaii.

#### A NUCLEAR TEST BAN AS A FIRST STEP TOWARD MUTUAL DISARMAMENT

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, today we find ourselves engaged in a never-ending gigantic arms race, firm in our belief that our national security depends in large part upon our ability to keep pace in such a race. Paradoxically, we recognize the necessity for ending this arms race, for it has greatly multiplied international tensions, burdened our political and military institutions, and strained our Nation's economy. We know too that in the long run, our national security cannot be maintained by military means alone.

Yet casting down our weapons cannot in itself offer a satisfactory solution. Unilateral disarmament and isolationistic refusal to support international organizations marked our mistaken retreat from responsibility following World War I. We have learned that disarmament must be multilateral, adequately inspected and appropriately phased. We look to the day when effective disarmament is established and law replaces force through a workable world security system.

A bomb of 10 megatons, available in quantity to both armed camps, has more destructive power than all the weapons exploded by all the participants in World War II. Disarmament, the thorough and lasting protection against the unleashing of such weapons, must therefore be the responsibility of every thinking man. There can be no question of its status as a bipartisan issue.

Hans J. Morgenthau has said:

Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, is the reflection of the power relations among the nations concerned. Disarmament, no less than the armaments race, reacts upon the power relations from which it arose. As the armaments race aggravates the struggle for power through the fear it generates and the burden it imposes, so disarmament contributes to the improvement of the political situation by lessening political tensions and by creating confidence in the purposes of the respective nations.

Mr. Speaker, our participation in the present arms race is justified by our desire to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that no nation can pursue an aggressive policy free from the fear of retaliation. Our desire is to convince the Soviets that if they abandon their expansionist aims, peaceful coexistence awaits them.

A nuclear test ban treaty is necessary as a first step toward an enforceable multilateral disarmament agreement, which is in turn essential to the creation of an atmosphere in which all nations may live secure from the fear of war.

I am sure each of us realizes the difficulties involved in obtaining an acceptable test ban agreement. It is all too easy to allow the need for complex security measures, and the demonstrated intransigence of the Soviet Union, to foster a spirit of defeatism. It is precisely these factors which make American initiative imperative. If it is our desire to guard against the dangers of radioactive fallout, to reduce the crushing economic burden of the arms race, and most importantly, to take the steps necessary to the achievement of effective and mutual disarmament, then the constant effort for a workable test ban treaty must remain as a basic tenet of our Nation's foreign policy. We must not be content to point to the past lack of cooperative response from the Soviet Union to justify a reduced intensity of our own efforts. If we as a nation are sincere in our professed desire for world peace, and we most certainly are, there can be no difficulty so great as to lift from our shoulders the burden of constant effort.

Clearly there are risks involved in any test ban treaty. The risk of secret undetected testing has been widely discussed. The consensus of expert opinion seems to be that while such a risk exists, it is an extremely small one and more importantly, the results of any testing that could avoid detection would not have measurable influence on the military balance of power. The point that is so often overlooked in the consideration of test ban risks is the considerable risk involved in the continuation of unrestricted testing. The generation of cumulative, poisonous fallout, the expansion of nuclear weaponry, the possibility of the Soviet Union gaining nuclear parity—all these must be remembered by those who would consider risk.

It seems strange that those who would never agree to a ban on outer space research, desiring an opportunity to catch up to the Soviet Union, wholeheartedly support the principle of unrestricted testing. The balance of nuclear power is in

our favor today, but it was considerably more so 10 years ago. Those who view a test ban treaty as an idealistic compromise and one which contradicts our vital national interests, had best reconsider the alternative effects of unrestricted nuclear testing.

World security cannot rest on disarmament alone. There must be a strengthening of international organizations and a corresponding strengthening of the respect of all nations for these organizations. No number of inspection teams can replace the genuine easing of international tensions. There must be a growth among all nations of a feeling of respect for humanity. We must never lose sight of the fact that a test ban treaty is only a beginning, only an initial step in the treatment of one symptom of international disorder. A test ban treaty cannot end the bitterness of national hatreds, cannot provide a solution to the problems of poverty, disease, and overpopulation. Yet we must never allow the enormity of the tasks before us to becloud the fact that we can advance by taking only a step at a time. Such a treaty would be a historic forward step in the establishment of a world secure in peace and free from fear.

I congratulate the gentleman from California [Mr. EDWARDS] for calling the attention of Congress to the need for bipartisan support of the administration's effort toward world peace and join him in wishing Under Secretary of State Harriman success and Godspeed in his present mission in Moscow.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. I congratulate my good friend, the gentleman from Hawaii on his creative and thoughtful speech. It is always a rare treat to be in the House when he speaks.

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield with pleasure to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. VAN DEERLIN].

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in offering heartfelt support to Governor Harriman in his efforts to negotiate a treaty banning nuclear weapons tests. Mr. Harriman is one of many dedicated Americans who, over the past 17 years, have been called upon by three different Presidents to accept the heavy responsibility of trying to achieve a meaningful agreement with the Russians.

We owe a deep debt of gratitude to these men. Despite the frustration of many past failures—in the face of constantly shifting arguments, and often beset by carping criticism from the home front—they have persisted in negotiations, firmly and fairly.

These men have come from both political parties. Holding widely divergent political and social views, they have been united by a common hope: to achieve a peaceful world, secure against the ravages of weaponry unknown two decades ago.

As a Democrat, I should like to read the roll of some of these men from the opposite party who—with Governor Harriman and other able statesmen of

my party—have dispelled any doubt of our ability to deal effectively with Communists.

There is Republican Harold Stassen, the former Governor of Minnesota, who served as our Director of Foreign Operations under President Eisenhower.

There is the former Republican Senator Henry Cabot Lodge. As our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. Lodge presented an American image of aggressive diplomacy and nobility of purpose. He is still carrying on the struggle.

And the list includes such names as James J. Wadsworth, a former Republican Congressman from New York State who led the American delegation to an 87-nation conference on the Statute of the International Atomic Energy Agency; Frederick M. Eaton, the Republican industrialist-diplomat; John J. McCloy, a Republican banker-industrialist who served as president of the World Bank; William C. Foster, a Republican corporation executive who was Administrator of the Economic Cooperation Administration, and Arthur Hobson Dean, a noted Republican lawyer.

Averell Harriman, a Democrat with a long and distinguished record in public service, carries on a noble quest which has been—and must remain—a wholly bipartisan effort.

I am delighted that support for Mr. Harriman comes from both sides of the aisle in this House, as witnessed by the words of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN]. Mr. Harriman carries our trust to do his best for us, and for the world, in these critically important negotiations.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the distinguished gentleman from California for his fine words here today.

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I now yield with pleasure to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. FRASER].

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, one of the major specters haunting the world's leaders and especially our President is the likelihood that many nations may soon possess nuclear weapons. Most recently at Bonn, President Kennedy said a test ban agreement would help avert the disaster of a spread of nuclear weapons.

At his news conference March 21, speaking of the importance of a test ban agreement, the President said:

With all the history of war—and the human race's history unfortunately has been a good deal more war than peace—with nuclear weapons distributed all through the world, and available, and the strong reluctance of any people to accept defeat, I see the possibility in the 1970's of the President of the United States having to face a world in which 15 or 20 or 25 nations may have these weapons. I regard that as the greatest possible danger and hazard.

Students of this problem suggest that the countries which have the necessary economic base, industrial capacity, and skilled manpower for at least a primitive nuclear weapons program in the near

future include Belgium, Canada, China, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, West Germany, India, Italy, Japan, Sweden, and Switzerland.

We in the Congress cannot escape our own responsibility in the matter. Under our Constitution we have an important role to play in developing and implementing foreign policy.

We must do more than criticize, find fault, and note shortcomings in proposals. We also need to face the same prospect the President faces—to see a world with 10 to 20 nations who once counted little in the balance of power, but who have, through the acquisition of nuclear weapons, become capable of inflicting intolerable damage and injury to any other nation; we must recognize the possibility of inflamed passions, old hatreds and regional quarrels bringing on a world holocaust; and envisage the difficulties facing an American President in a world where nuclear weapons are the great equalizers between large and small powers, and where nuclear blackmail may become commonplace. One of the main purposes of a test-ban treaty is to prevent this potential nightmare from becoming a reality.

Would a test-ban treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union guarantee there will be no more nuclear powers? Obviously not, since there is no way to force nonsigners to comply with the treaty's terms.

Would a test-ban treaty inhibit and deter the proliferation of nuclear weapons? Definitely yes. If the United States and the Soviet Union agree to end nuclear tests it could then be possible to bring economic, technical, diplomatic and psychological pressures to bear on nonnuclear powers. Those groups within each nation opposed to their country's development of nuclear weapons would be immeasurably strengthened. The annual, overwhelming U.N. vote against nuclear testing and the proliferation of nuclear weapons would acquire even more significance. This step might well be followed, as Secretary Rusk and others have suggested, by an agreement by the nuclear powers not to transfer nuclear weapons to nonnuclear powers and by more far-reaching steps toward the development of international institutions under which we could explore disarmament with confidence.

Some argue that because Communist China and France might not be parties to the agreement, we should not enter it. This is a little like saying that because it may not be possible to have just 3 nuclear powers, it is better to have 15 instead of 5. Moreover, it may be that future developments we cannot now foresee will persuade these two countries not to develop their nuclear weapons systems to their full destructive capabilities.

A test-ban treaty is clearly in our own national interest. The fact that it is also in the national interest of the Soviet Union lends substance to the hopes and prayers of millions of people around the world that Governor Harriman will be successful in his current mission to Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from California for providing this opportunity to air the views of many Members of Congress on the important mission in the negotiation being conducted in Moscow. I hope that his work will be well repaid.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman. It was indeed a privilege to hear this thoughtful speech given here today by my distinguished colleague from Minnesota.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDWARDS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, why do we test nuclear weapons? To improve our stockpile? And what is that stockpile like now? Mr. Speaker, one expert—Dr. Ralph Lapp—has called it incredible; and incredible is certainly a good word, since Dr. Lapp over a year ago estimated its size at a minimum of 30,000 megatons. Since the bomb that destroyed Hiroshima was only one-fiftieth of a megaton—not one-fifth, Mr. Speaker, but one-fiftieth—that means the United States now has the explosive equivalent of 1,500,000 Hiroshima bombs in its arsenal. Let me repeat that—the United States has one and a half million Hiroshima equivalents in its nuclear arsenal. That sounds a lot more real and understandable to me than megaton estimates—and every time I sit down and think about such a reality I also think it is incredible.

That is quite a stockpile—one and a half million Hiroshima units—so big a stockpile that any sensible person might ask why we need anymore. Now I know that having such a stockpile does not mean we could destroy one and a half million cities the size of Hiroshima even if there were that many cities in the whole world. Some of the bombs are so big that they would have a great deal of explosive power left over around the edges—going to waste, so to speak. Some of the bombs and missiles would miss their target and land in the countryside or on our allies, or even on us. Some would never get fired because communication channels had gone haywire under the pressure of crisis or had failed under attack, or because some local commander had lost control of himself. So the existence of 1,500,000 Hiroshima equivalents in our stockpile does not mean they could all be used in time of war.

Still—assume that one way or another only one-hundredth of the potential gets used. That is 15,000 Hiroshima equivalents. Can we imagine how much war that would be? The word war would have nothing to do with the case—15,000 Hiroshima units is not war, it is a holocaust. And I use the word in its original meaning—everything burns. If anybody has trouble remembering what just one single Hiroshima meant, let him look at two photographs I have seen by courtesy of the Atomic Energy Commission. Both were taken from the air over Hiroshima. The first shows a teeming, bustling city. The second is empty. The river is still there,



the hills are still there—in fact they are more apparent—but the city—the people, the streets, the buildings—are just gone.

Imagine 15,000 of that—and that is only one-hundredth of a minimum estimate of our current nuclear stockpile.

Now of course that figure of 15,000 Hiroshimas doesn't mean much unless you compare it with the possible targets. In the Soviet Union, Communist Eastern Europe, and China all put together there are only 370 cities with 100,000 population or more. If you look just at plans for highly invulnerable missile production and emplacement—leave out bombers, leave out vulnerable missiles, leave out so-called tactical nuclear weapons—the United States plans to have 950 Minutemen and 656 Polaris. That's a total of about 1,500 missiles, each of which could destroy a city. Some of them would misfire, some would miss, and some of the Polaris-carrying submarines might be in harbor during a crisis. But if just half the Polaris and all the Minutemen were available and only one-third of them get through, we could still destroy about 400 cities—which is every city in the whole Communist bloc, even including our captive friends in Poland, Hungary, and the rest of Eastern Europe.

That is a lot of death. In fact, it is overkill. I hope the Speaker will forgive me for spelling out this nightmare, because I did so for a reason. I want to point out that we can destroy our enemies more than once—if you can imagine destroying anything or killing anybody more than once—and we can do this even if we never test another nuclear weapon. We can do it out of our present arsenal, even if we never produce another nuclear weapon—let alone test new kinds of weapons.

So much for those who talk as if the United States would be naked and unarmed if we stopped nuclear testing today. Now, what about the more sophisticated arguments against testing? These can be summed up under two headings—which really add up to one so-called strategy; the notion that H-bombs can be aimed solely at H-bombs instead of people, and the notion that nuclear testing might somehow magically produce a defense against nuclear weapons. Together these notions add up to the idea that you can fight a war with H-bombs and get out of it with a whole skin. It is sometimes called the theory of counterforce war, or no-cities war, or limited strategic war.

This theory is absurd. As the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], said on April 11, 1962:

There have been some estimates and some so-called mathematical computations of the casualties that would result from a nuclear war under various assumptions, including a positive attempt by the adversaries to limit targeting to military installations and facilities. I have no hesitancy in saying, however, that to me these extrapolations, or projections, or hypotheses are exceedingly unrealistic. They presuppose a rational restraint by both sides that I doubt would exist in the awful eventuality of a nuclear attack. This kind of reasoning, if carried to its logical extension, would lead one to

believe that an international conflict could be settled under controlled combat or even by a game of some type in which the opponents were in agreement on the rules and abided by them.

And he continued:

I am afraid that we would be deluding ourselves to base our national policy on an assumption that our potential adversaries would be restrained and rational. In my opinion, if nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination.

I am fully able to agree with the chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the other body on that point. If nuclear war begins, it will be a war of extermination. No counterforce targeting, no anti-ICBM's, can save us then. Since so much has been made of the possibility of an anti-ICBM as a reason to keep on with our nuclear testing, I want to cite what one of our greatest scientists, Hans Bethe, said on this point on January 5, 1962:

It is not very difficult to design a defensive missile which will come close enough to an ICBM to destroy it by means of an atomic explosion. There is also no problem about providing atomic warheads for antimissiles. But the offense can send decoys along with its missiles which are almost impossible to distinguish from the missiles, and they can send many missiles simultaneously which saturate the radars of the defense. Thus, I think AICBM is virtually hopeless, and the deterrent can remain stable for a long time.

If there is a military answer to and a military defense against H-bombs, Mr. Speaker, it will come from a science as much beyond nuclear technology as nuclear science was beyond TNT technology before 1939—and a scientific advance like that will not come from testing nuclear weapons any more than the first atomic bomb came from testing TNT.

And so, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in which the present nuclear arsenal of the United States is more than enough to destroy any enemy. We could add to our present arsenal, if we wished to do so, without ever testing another weapon. Why do we need to test? If we can achieve with the Russians an agreement that makes it extremely likely that neither we nor they could test without the other one knowing it, why in Heaven's name—and I say Heaven's name deliberately, and without blasphemy—why in Heaven's name should we want to test?

Mr. Harriman and his delegation are now in Moscow, probing to see if the Russians are serious about concluding a nuclear test ban treaty. If so, perhaps we are at long last about to start down the road toward dismantling the modern warmaking potential in all countries. A nuclear test ban would be an important first step.

I for one, Mr. Speaker, and I know for a fact a heavy majority of my constituents as well, will fully and vigorously support the President in his efforts to bring home the kind of agreement I have mentioned.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from California for the important things he said here today in his most significant speech.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great interest to the dissertation on this question of nuclear testing and since I have some strong feelings about it, I had hoped to prepare a statement that I could present myself at this time. However, I do not have it ready at this moment, so I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that while this discussion may aid and abet in strengthening the hand of Mr. Harriman, as he represents our Government on this question of the cessation of nuclear testing, I doubt that it can have a great deal of influence, and I am not sure that I want it to have a great deal of influence, because I am not sure that I know all the factors that are involved at this particular time.

However, I think it may be worth while to say at this time that while this conference may be worth while, and I hope it is successful and will be in the interest of humanity and in the public interest of my country, I think that it may be more urgent to at the same time we consider these days a proposition that would bring about a positive approach to the solution of some of the real problems that are presented in attaining the peace that we want and I believe the peace that people want everywhere. The problem of getting our own people and the people of the world to understand what it is that we the people want most to do on the world arena.

It seems to me that we need to enunciate a statement on this question that is consistent with our own heritage and experience in freedom and liberty in this country. It seems to me that we can learn what to do by reading again the history of our own country and trying to catch something of the spirit that burned in the hearts of these great patriots, these forefathers of ours who we know now had some great and noble ideas, and we now know that they built here a firm foundation. And then we need to do what we can to put that spirit that burned in their hearts, in the hearts and minds of people everywhere who want the freedoms that we have, and to develop in their hearts and minds the same kind of desire that we have here, the same kind of sense of dedication to the basic freedoms, such as freedom from want and fear, freedom of speech, freedom to worship, et cetera, and another great and important freedom, freedom of movement, movement of men and goods—of movement of ideas and ideals.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that while we are doing this, we ought also to think about developing a program that has a greater appeal on the foreign front and that more truly represents what we want here not only for ourselves but for the people of the world.

And so while I want to join and applaud this effort, I want to say also that I am not sure that it is going to have a great influence, but I think what has been said here today and what has been put in the RECORD will be worth reading. I hope the people will read what the gentleman has presented and I hope, when I have more time to go over what is in my mind directly in regard to this question of testing, to make my further views known. I might say that I made a statement two years ago on this question of testing which revealed my position clearly. Perhaps it would be timely for me, and of some value, to put that in the RECORD at this time. I said this in addressing a meeting of the Farm Women in Iowa in November 1961.

After calling attention to the fact that we had a great stockpile of bombs on hand, at that time—not as much as we have now—and that I felt because of that and because of what I knew about our other defense posture, we had an adequate defense, and that I thought that common sense and decency dictated that our Government then should not be participating in any further testing of the nuclear bomb—and I said then underground or aboveground. I said we should not do this until and unless this can be done without contamination of any kind, pointing out that we had no right as individuals or as nations—when I say “we” I include all humanity, all nations—to contaminate the air that everybody needs to breathe and that nature must have to give us sustenance, any more than we had the right to pollute the waters of our rivers out of which everybody does not have to drink. So I am clearly on the side of no testing and I hope we can bring about some kind of system that will assure the removal of nuclear testing everywhere.

I hope that our leaders can come to some kind of agreement in which we can have confidence and that will head us away from this terrible abyss that I think we are headed for, that could be very disastrous as far as the human family is concerned.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman from Iowa. I commend the gentleman for his humane and thoughtful speech here today. I think all of us here in the House of Representatives today are better because of what the gentleman from Iowa said.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. CAMERON. Mr. Speaker, “history,” said President Kennedy in his American University speech of June 10, “teaches us that enmities between nations, as between individuals, do not last forever. However fixed our likes and dislikes may seem, the tide of time and events will often bring surprising changes in the relations between nations and neighbors.”

Signs of surprising change are indeed coming to us almost faster than we can assimilate them. And yet, if we are to exploit to free-world advantage the international undercurrents swirling beneath the Communist iceberg, we must continually probe the diplomatic depths

and attempt to sail with the tide of history.

Today, in Moscow, Gov. Averell Harriman is probing the depths. He is doing this because the President and all rational Americans are convinced that continued nuclear testing is exceedingly dangerous, and that if it is not stopped this year it is likely to spiral beyond the control of man. A partial test ban agreement hopefully will become an effective tool for inhibiting the spread of nuclear weapons to reckless nations—particularly Red China.

As we rivet our attention on Moscow, where the Soviets are turning their faces to us and their backs on Peiping, it is impossible to paint a rosy picture of tomorrow with a brush dipped in the colors of today. Now is merely a time to hope, to observe, to speculate, to look at our subject from many angles and, at best, pencil in a few lines on the world canvas. It is encouraging to know that Mr. Harriman, a veteran diplomat with a reputation for wariness, wields a perceptive pencil.

The overly optimistic, however, are already talking of a possible summit meeting between President Kennedy and Premier Khrushchev. In this regard, I think it prudent to recall an observation made by Mr. Rusk before he became Secretary of State. “I conclude,” said Mr. Rusk, “that summit diplomacy is to be approached with the wariness with which a prudent physician prescribes a habit-forming drug.”

We must remember that when we are dealing with the Soviets, we are dealing with an adversary. And we are dealing with a situation where the consequences of failure are very great, where failure may very well toll the bell for destruction of our planet. In my judgment, we must not rush headlong into a demand for a summit, because when we sit at the summit we sit in the court of last resort.

Equally as immature, and potentially as dangerous, as the view of the overwrought optimist, is the vision of the incorrigible skeptic, the habitual saberrattler, the Yahoo-myopic who believes that nothing changes but the tide, unaware that the ship of state has weathered the storms of two centuries simply because its captains took advantage of the fact that men and nations, like the tide, are ever changing.

It is unfortunate that many Americans have been hesitant—if not adamantly opposed—to carefully examining the discernible split between Red China and the Soviet Union, as well as changes throughout the entire Communist bloc.

In the July 14 edition of the Washington Post, Stephen Rosenfeld writes:

Josef Stalin would gasp to see how his tight empire in Eastern Europe has unraveled into a loose skein of partially sovereign states.

He mentions Albania in the Chinese camp, Rumania refusing to attend the recent Communist summit meeting in East Berlin because of dissatisfaction with Soviet economic dictation, and the difficulties encountered by the U.S.S.R. in trying to tuck such diverse countries

as Yugoslavia, Cuba, and Mongolia under its ideological wing.

Openings to the West—through tourism, exchanges, trade, diplomacy—have had a related effect—

Points out Mr. Rosenfeld—

they ventilate Eastern Europe, sharpen its ideas of the alternatives to the Soviet system, and freshen the forces of change.

These forces of change, I submit, are invisible to those jingoists among us who stand with their feet rooted in the 19th century and their heads buried in the 18th.

These ostriches of obtuse reasoning, I might add, are precisely the same individuals who by rule-of-thumb regard aid to Poland and Yugoslavia as giving dynamite to the enemy, never stopping to realize that dynamite, planted in the proper fissure, can rip huge chunks from mountains of rock, as well as from mountains of ideology.

To illustrate my point, I quote from a statement made by a prominent American statesman in the other body:

To those who rather naively state that, despite our aid, Poland and Yugoslavia are both still Communist states, I would like to point out that no nation's political orientation was ever transformed overnight. \* \* \* the surprising thing is not their failure to exorcise communism, but, rather, the fact that they have gone so far in asserting their own interests in the face of constant Soviet intimidation.

It can be hoped that as an increasing number of Poles and Yugoslavs taste a certain amount of independence and freedom, they will pay even less attention to these [Soviet] admonitions than they presently do. And to broaden the area of freedom is the prime objective of U.S. aid to both countries.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are probably thinking, this statement did not originate in the White House. It was made by a Republican Senator—not KUCHEL or JAVITS—but the GOP leader, Mr. DIRKSEN, who, as we all know, is not a pioneer on this New Frontier.

In this same regard, it was none other than the late John Foster Dulles who said in 1958:

There is nothing inevitable about communism except that it, too, is bound to change. The forces that change it are already at work and discernible.

Mr. Dulles cited the effects of education—the demand for greater personal security and for more consumer goods, and nationalism in the satellite countries as among the factors which were even then changing the Communist world.

In examining the world scene with a coldness and calmness born of repeated frustration in the frozen wastes of the cold war, what comfort can we take from the increasing strains and tensions within the Communist bloc? Hope must always be tempered with caution. For the Sino-Soviet disagreement is over means—not ends. A rift over how to bury the West is no grounds for uncontrolled rejoicing; it is grounds for calculating appraisal.

The future must be charted with caution because I foresee no spectacular reversal in Communist goals. But I am



hopeful that with resolute patience we can exploit to our advantage the frictions and fractures in the Communist bloc. And if all these trends and developments—can persuade the Soviet Union to walk the path of nuclear peace, then let her know that this Nation will join with her. But until that choice is definitely made, and until our two nations can develop a reliable system of international nuclear security, we have no choice but to keep our weapons near.

During the historic confrontation of October 1962 Khrushchev learned that despite Chinese admonitions, President Kennedy was no paper-tiger—that he would step over the brink. And the President learned that Khrushchev would step back from the brink.

Out of the confrontation came one important—and unforgettable fact—American leadership, and the present Soviet leadership, are both committed to averting a nuclear holocaust.

Among the major goals of American foreign policy is to strive tirelessly to end the arms race and reduce the risk of war, to narrow the areas of conflict with the Communist bloc, and continue to spin the infinity of threads that bind peace together; that is, to win peace through perseverance.

I am confident that Governor Harriman will persevere in the finest tradition of American statesmanship. I wish him good luck and a prosperous journey.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. HANNA].

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, there is in progress at this time a greatly publicized negotiation session. Its setting is in the capital of the sworn antagonist of our way of life, in Moscow. It is the avowed purpose of this meeting to develop outlines of proposals to restrict and limit nuclear testing. Such steps would, to begin with, hold promise for discontinuance of radioactive contamination in the air and therefore in the food and water of the world. It would also suggest checks on the proliferation of nuclear arms and their potentials. Over, above, and beyond this it well could start our generation along the first pathway to an elimination of nuclear weapons as a threat to peace.

There is a great division in the attitudes of those who watch and wait. There are those who reflect doubt, distrust, and pessimism. These expect at least complete discouragement and at worst some present day example of the Chamberlain experience with Hitler. There is from these sources already the mutterings of "appeasement." They speak in dark terms about a "deal" which will somehow spell disaster for our side and some untold advantage or victory for the Russians.

Others there are who have all too early placed the optimistic tone to the turn of things. These sources are already assuring that the Sino-Russian split spells certain affirmative results for a test ban. Like the words of a popular song of the same name, they have high hopes.

In full deference to the situation, giving due credit to the caliber of our negotiator, Mr. Harriman, one still feels that

the difficulties of domestic politics and the limitations of alliance or bloc entanglements dictate that neither the dismal predictions of the detractors nor the great expectations of the Pollyannas is likely to be the outcome. This should not totally discourage us for the task fundamentally involved in this present exchange is far more important than any immediate results.

The purpose the talks are serving is not only the cause of peace—and there is hardly any greater cause—but beyond that the challenging, frustrating quest for a substitute for war. The gauntlet laid down by the atom is simple but awesome—"Man, find a substitute for the use of ultimate force in your disputations—or else." No nation or group of nations is exempt from this ultimatum. It now devolves upon the leadership of the present two great powers to begin the quest. The alternative explicit in the atom's challenge is unacceptable to any people in any part of the world.

Let me make it clear that what is suggested here is not that we dispense with the force we now have, nor do we intimate that such force should not be maintained and improved in the light of existing realities. What we are soberly stating is that there is no answer to the atom's challenge in the nuclear arms race. It courts the deadly alternative. It is clearly not enough. While we may justify our desire to maintain equilibrium in the status quo, we continue to live under the sword of Damocles. Without progress in a more positive and productive direction, the continuing tensions tempt restraints that possess only limited standing powers.

Regardless of our appraisal of Mr. Khrushchev, his honesty or true purpose, in spite of the sad history of some past arguments, we can agree that:

First. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in avoiding war.

Second. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in limiting the spread of nuclear weapons.

Third. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in reducing the burdensome costs of the present arms race.

Fourth. Russians, as well as Americans, have an interest in the health and perfection of their coming generations of children.

Based upon the commonality of these rather important interests, reasonable minds must agree that there exists impressive motivations for the seeking of affirmative results and progress. Although we can expect the bargainers for the Russians to seek every advantage they can gain in any mutually acceptable line of approach, we have in our corner a rather well prepared Yankee horse trader. He has already shown himself to be richly endowed with most of the gifts requisite for the role he now is playing.

It is my personal feeling that the sentiments expressed by President Kennedy in his American University speech and in his presentations while in Germany place the guidelines for our man in Moscow in classic simplicity and clarity. He in effect has said—we know our friends and we shall keep faith with them. We

know our foe and respect him and will keep a vigilant and watchful eye on him. We shall seek peace courageously and continuously by every means commensurate with safety. We recognize that the encompassing, abiding interest of all this earth and all the peoples in it is an honorable peace achieved within the bounds of such safety. We are willing to labor long and with fervent intent for this great and good cause. No carping of poorly informed critics nor the importunings of ambitious politicians should deter or discourage negotiations founded on such principles. Rather we should be asking how we might play a productive part in providing the patience, the perseverance and the prayerful effort this noble work requires.

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ROSENTHAL].

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in expressing support for Mr. Harriman's mission to Moscow. I am particularly proud of the fact that the President has named this distinguished New Yorker, and our former Governor, as his emissary.

Most of us have been concerned and discouraged over the protracted nature of the test ban negotiations, but at long last success seems to be in the offing. Yet many Americans still seriously question whether we can ever reach an agreement with the Russians or trust them to abide by any agreement which might be reached.

I can sympathize with this view, but given the instability of the nuclear age, and the dangers of accidental war, I am willing to gamble on the fact that the Russians have as much to gain from turning down the arms race as we have. We have reached mutually advantageous agreements with the Russians in the past; these negotiations demand that we do so again.

We need to recall and analyze those past negotiations so that we can more easily determine the ingredients which make for success. Such a historical study should also help us develop a more philosophical attitude toward the difficulties involved in negotiating with the Russians. It would also serve to remind us that there have been mutually advantageous agreements which the Russians have kept.

Let me review with you the case histories of two of these instances—the decade of negotiations that preceded the signing of the Austrian Peace Treaty and the year and a half of negotiations that culminated in the Antarctic Treaty.

With regard to the Austrian Treaty, the Soviets were intransigent for many years. There were basic issues in dispute between the West and the Soviet Union; the definition and disposition of German assets in Austria; the question of Yugoslav claims to Austrian reparations and Austrian territory and the withdrawal of occupation troops. Still other issues, real or feigned, which the Soviet Union brought into the negotiations included the alleged resurgence of Nazism in Austria; the alleged remilitarization of Austria; Soviet claims against Austria for relief supplies; the

Trieste question and an insistence that a German peace treaty must be signed before an Austrian treaty could be completed.

But these difficulties were finally overcome and Austria's independence was restored. How were these difficulties overcome? They were overcome in part because the Western Powers never gave up. They kept on pushing. Then too Russia was apparently anxious to neutralize Austria, and Austria offered to refrain from joining any military alliance or permitting any foreign military bases on its territory.

The Antarctica negotiations of June 1958 to December 1959 were a much more harmonious affair and resulted in a very significant treaty which demilitarizes the entire continent. As you will recall, the participants included the United States, the Soviet Union and the 10 other countries who conducted Antarctica programs during the International Geophysical Year. Under the treaty these nations agree that Antarctica shall be used for peaceful purposes only; that there shall be no nuclear explosions or any disposal of radioactive wastes in that continent; that each nation signing the treaty has a right to carry on unilateral inspection of all areas of Antarctica, including all stations and installations in these areas; and that there shall be freedom of scientific investigation and continued scientific cooperation in Antarctica.

At the concluding session of the Conference on Antarctica the Russian delegate spoke of the negotiating sessions as proceeding in "an atmosphere of business-like cooperation and mutual understanding which yielded fruitful results." One of the U.S. representatives said:

We have concluded basic agreements which will be of benefit to ourselves, and of benefit to all mankind. It is in that spirit that the United States has been proud to associate itself with the other countries represented at this Conference in concluding these broad and far-reaching agreements on Antarctica.

Now, so far as I can gather, none of the participants have changed their minds about the merits of this treaty. Delegates from the signatory governments have met twice since 1959; once in 1961 and again in 1962 to formulate recommendations to further the principles and objectives of the treaty. These sessions were reportedly conducted in the same spirit of international harmony which inspired the signing of the treaty and delegates reached agreement on a number of recommendations relating to cooperation in various aspects of scientific investigation, logistics, communications and the conservation of living resources in the treaty area.

Let us hope for a similar ending to the Harriman mission.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who spoke here today be permitted to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous matter, and that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks in the RECORD on this subject.

CIX—817

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California? There was no objection.

#### SPAIN UNDER FRANCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. RYAN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. RYAN of New York. Mr. Speaker, as we note the 27th anniversary of the Spanish Civil War, the totalitarian regime of Generalissimo Franco again is proclaiming the imminent liberalization of Spanish life and institutions. We would do well to look closely before concluding that the Franco regime is no longer a police state. Generalissimo Franco's recent interest in image building goes back to the summer of 1962, when a cabinet shakeup brought some younger faces into his government, a relaxation of the tight regulations on censorship was announced, and changes in the custom of summary military trials for political prisoners were promised. This coincided with Great Britain's negotiations to enter the European Common Market. Britain is Spain's best customer abroad. If Britain joined the European Community, economic considerations would impel Spain to seek membership in the Common Market. For Spain to be admitted to the Common Market, Franco had to win the favor of Western European democrats—those same Western European democrats from whom he had sealed off Spain for a quarter of a century.

After General de Gaulle vetoed Britain's application for admission to the Common Market, the pressure was removed, and the process of relaxation in Spain came to halt. The regime announced a return to tight censorship. The promised law modifying the jurisdiction of the military courts was held up. During the 2 months after February 20, 1963, 103 persons were sentenced for political crimes, after being tried under the very procedure which the highly respected International Commission of Jurists had condemned in December 1962, as a flagrant violation of generally accepted legal standards in a study entitled "Spain and the Rule of Law." The 104th person, Julian Grimau, was shot, in part for events that took place 25 years earlier during the Civil War. Grimau was a Communist, and the Soviet Union made the most of his execution for propaganda purposes, but the outraged demonstrations of thousands of Western Europeans were not composed merely of Communists. The French Government temporarily suspended financial negotiations.

The strength of the European reaction is among the reasons why Generalissimo Franco is again trying to disguise the nature of his police state. One hundred and sixty Spanish miners who were deported for the "crime" of striking last August are being permitted to return home. The proposal to modify the jurisdiction of the military courts has been dusted off and approved by the cabinet. The Franco regime has again expressed

an interest in European integration, indicating that Spain would like to join NATO.

The fact remains, however, that after 26 years Spain is still a dictatorship. Nothing has happened during the past 3 years to modify the verdict of 339 Basque priests, who in a collective letter to the four Basque bishops on May 30, 1960, expressed their opinion about the social injustice and abuse of government authority. In the words of the Basque priests:

No genuine parliament, no genuine political or trade union freedom exists in Spain. The single party, the single syndicalist organization and a controlled parliament make up the essential structure of the Spanish state, and all are entirely subject to the Chief of State.

In 1962, 80 Spaniards from Spain joined with 38 exiled fellow-citizens to constitute the Spanish delegation to the European Movement Assembly which met in Munich. The Spanish delegation unanimously supported a resolution, which the Assembly adopted by acclamation, which said that Spanish entrance to the Common Market should be conditional on the creation of authentically democratic institutions in Spain. The recognition by the Franco regime of five elemental civil rights was demanded.

Franco's reaction to this declaration reveals his attitude about civil liberties. All Spaniards were deprived of their freedom of residence for 2 years. About 25 Spanish delegates to the Munich Conference were exiled abroad or to the Canary Islands, including Gil Robles, who would probably be the head of a conservative Christian Democratic Party if Spain were a free country.

Other liberty-loving Spaniards were sent to jail, where they joined a host of fellow political prisoners. One, Demetrio Luis Marcos Pablo, a teacher of commerce in Madrid, had been sentenced to 12 years imprisonment for printing in 1957 that "a bunch of gangsters rule us," and again in 1958 that "Francoism has never been an expression of the people's will," and finally in the same year an "Open Letter to the Youth of Spain." Demetrio Luis' letter ends with this exhortation:

Spaniards, your duty is to fight everywhere and at all times against Francoism and all that goes with it.

There is nothing unique about the experience of Demetrio Luis Marcos Pablo. The Basque priests observed in their letter of protest that they—and I quote:

Are continually hearing of men who have been arrested for temporal activities which are not in conformity with the political thinking—along one line only—imposed by the state.

People are imprisoned for expressing in public, or indeed in private, political ideas contrary to those of the government. And since the normal channels for the communication of truth do not exist, what in fact is simply the exercise of a right becomes an offense.

In the 24 years during which the present regime has been in power, men have been imprisoned sine die for months and years, and brought, after a period of time depending on the arbitrary decision of a governor, the director of the public security department, or some minister, before a special court under



the very serious charge of "rebellion against the state," because they had the courage to believe that those who govern them are neither impeccable nor infallible. Once they have been taken to prison, their families live in a state of perpetual anguish, since they neither know where they are nor when they may be tried.

The basic doctrine and program of the Spanish governing party proclaims that "our state shall be a totalitarian instrument." Like any totalitarian instrument, it seeks to control every aspect of a person's life. Spanish unions, for example, are no more than a part of the state machinery. On November 16, 1960, the Cardinal Primate of Spain pointed out in a letter to the Secretary-General of the Falange, or National Movement, that the syndicates as then organized provided no genuine representation to the working classes. The Basque priests expressed themselves even more clearly in their letter to the four Basque bishops:

The Spanish syndicate is neither a trade union nor Christian. It is the creation of the state, and it defends the interest of the state \* \* \* Genuine trade unionism, i.e., free trade unionism, springing from the working class and enjoying its confidence, is not only a right of the masses, but still more it is the most effective and suitable means in existence today by which the masses can exercise their responsibilities in social and economic life, responsibilities which involve both rights and duties.

Although strikes in Spain are illegal, the workers of Asturias, a traditionally revolutionary province, left their jobs for 2 months last year, and other workers all over Spain joined in the walkouts. Confronted with the most serious economic challenge it had faced since 1939, the Franco regime was forced to negotiate with representatives of unofficial workers' commissions as well as the local syndicates—a tacit admission that the syndicates do not reflect the desires of the workers. After the men returned to work, leading strikers were brought to trial. Spanish writers and painters were fined exorbitantly for taking part in a silent demonstration in favor of the Asturias strikers.

A large part of the clergy and the Catholic lay brotherhoods were behind the strikes. Before the strikes the majority of Spanish workers earned 33 to 50 pesetas—55 to 83 cents—a day. In the wake of the wage agreement, which the regime negotiated with the illegal strikers, the minimum wage was raised to 60 pesetas—\$1 a day. Accion Social Patronal, a Catholic employers' group, estimates that a married worker with two children cannot maintain a civilized standard of living in Madrid on less than 154 pesetas a day, and the cost of living in the northern and eastern cities of Spain is higher than in Madrid. The Bishop of Bilbao has declared in a pastoral epistle that whereas Spain is one of the countries with the lowest popular income in all Europe, it ranks the third highest in the world with regard to unnecessary expenditures. The bishop called the extravagance of the wealthy classes:

A provocation to those who lack the essential necessities in order to lead a dignified human existence, and they give rise to a

pathological condition within the social organism.<sup>1</sup>

When the image builders of the Spanish Government purchase a section of the New York Times to describe the dynamic progress which the country is making under Franco, they do not, of course, mention the grinding poverty which exists.

The reports that Spain has modified its strict censorship provide a good illustration of how the regime talks of relaxing controls without actually doing so. Last summer a new Minister of Information was appointed. He extolled freedom of expression to foreign journalists. However, this same Minister of Information, when addressing Portuguese journalists praised Franco's success in subordinating liberty to order and described freedom of the press as an anarchist utopia.

Editorial writers and reporters are still drilled in official views, and the Government can still dismiss any journalist who displeases it and remove his professional license. All news of political importance must be taken from the official news agency. The Basque priests described the Spanish press as a barrier to the expression of considered judgments on the activities of the political, economic, or social organs of the country. It imposes arbitrary restraints on the right of the free expression of opinion, and debars citizens from any public supervision of the administration of the public services.

Mr. Speaker, reports of relaxation of dictatorial control in Spain should be weighed in the light of the facts which I have related to the House.

I hope all Members of the House will give heed to the 339 Basque priests, who reminded us in their letter:

Freedom is one of the most sacrosanct and inviolable of rights, which the state is bound to recognize and respect.

We do not hesitate openly to proclaim that the full Christian conception of freedom is necessarily bound up with the inviolability of the human conscience. We affirm that it is not lawful to practice upon the human conscience either by using violence to penetrate its secrets, nor by submitting it to outside pressures working on the mind by methods contrary to all the proceedings of reason; it is not lawful to torture, nor make use of drugs or the procedures of brainwashing, nor subject public opinion to the pressures of a superpropaganda, based on psychological techniques which are an attack on the transcendental dignity of the human person.

We sincerely believe that neither the individual, nor the classes or peoples who make up the Spanish political community, enjoy sufficient freedom.

#### REWRITING HISTORY A TRICKY TASK

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FINDLEY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

<sup>1</sup> Ecclesia, Feb. 10, 1962.

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, it comes as somewhat of a surprise to learn that the President now feels Cuba was an American victory. Mr. Kennedy says:

Future historians, looking back at 1962, may well mark this year as the time when the tide of international politics began at last to flow strongly toward the world of diversity and freedom.

He makes this statement in the recently published 1962 volume of the Public Papers of the President of the United States.

In the Soviet Union, history books can be rewritten, and indeed they have been. But not here.

Manipulation of the news may fool the general public temporarily, but news management on a scale to hoodwink future scholars of history would be quite a tricky feat.

President Kennedy has had mixed results in his attempts to rewrite history.

The Associated Press, reporting on the latest volume of the Presidential papers, says the President felt that the Communists appeared to be holding the key to the scientific and technological future after sputnik in 1957.

Apparently this was before we won such notable "victories" as Cuba, Laos, the Congo, and the Berlin Wall.

The President blithely said:

People in many countries began to accept the notion that communism was mankind's inevitable destiny. Nineteen hundred and sixty-two stopped this process—and nothing was more important in deflating the notion of Communist invincibility than the American response to Soviet provocations in Cuba.

In all fairness and honesty, he should have added: "The American response to Soviet provocations in Cuba was short-lived. Russian troops and arms are still in Cuba."

The President did not follow through in his earlier demand for on-site inspection.

U.S. withdrawal of missile bases from Turkey and Italy during the period when Russian missiles supposedly were being withdrawn from Cuba caused fear throughout the free world that a deal had been made between Mr. Khrushchev and Mr. Kennedy.

The notion of Communist invincibility was only momentarily deflated during the Cuban confrontation.

Since then, Mr. Kennedy's lack of followthrough, Mr. Kennedy's clampdown on Cuban exile raiders, and Mr. Kennedy's acceptance of a Communist regime in Cuba have served, I fear, to reinflate the notion of Communist invincibility to its earlier dimensions and beyond.

#### FOR THE RELIEF OF THE JEFFERSON LOAN CO.

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CURTIS] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have reintroduced for the consideration of the

Subcommittee on Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary a private bill for the relief of the Jefferson Loan Co., and its corporate successor, the Jefferson Mortgage Co.

This corporation incurred tax liability and paid taxes in the business years ending January 31, 1947, and January 31, 1948, on the amounts reported in profits by certain of the corporation officers. In reality, there were no profits in those years and the profits reported were so reported as part of a plan by the officers involved to accomplish a fraud.

The corporation in question has since thrown out the faithless officers and now seek to have refunded to them the amount of the tax overpayments. Attempts to seek a remedy in the courts have pointed to the necessity of seeking relief through the Congress. The action taken to date in this regard has had the effect of visiting the wrongs of former officers on the present organization. The result of this is, as a matter of policy to reduce the incentive on the part of shareholders and other honest employees to throw out dishonest management. These people should not be punished for their salutary action, but should rather be encouraged to keep a close eye on management.

As a matter of fact this is just one more example among many which points to the need to review our general law which relates to the tax and other treatment of the corporate entity when alert stockholders remove management guilty of criminal action and replace it with law-abiding people.

#### TO AMEND THE INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1954

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. CLEVELAND] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced legislation to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax on toll telephone service and telegraph service to and from points outside the United States where paid for in the United States. Under existing law such services are subject to the 10-percent excise tax. However, if the service is paid for outside the United States, the tax is avoided.

Many people feel that the entire excise tax on telegraph and telephone service imposed during the Korean conflict as a temporary measure should be repealed. In fact, I voted against its extension on the floor of this House several weeks ago. However, all attempts to repeal the excise tax have been defeated in that it has been extended on an annual basis for some 10 years beyond its original expiration date.

The tax on service to and from points outside the United States, however, is a different matter. These taxes can be avoided, and are being avoided, by the simple expedient of having the calls paid

for outside the United States. As a result we have a tax that is easily avoided. There is no practical or feasible way to tighten this loophole. Therefore, in fairness to all, such a tax should be repealed. No tax which can so easily be avoided, is in fact being avoided in a widespread manner, and is incapable of proper enforcement, should be allowed to stand on the books.

#### A PROPOSED PERMANENT HOUSE COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LANGEN] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I have long felt there is too much redtape for proper consideration of the needs of the Nation's small businesses. The legislation that I have joined my colleagues in proposing would create a permanent House Committee on Small Business, giving it full legislative authority. In the past, since the House Small Business Committee has been only a study committee, it has resulted in unnecessary delays and duplication of functions. This repetitious process is not fair to the 4½ million small businessmen in America.

In addition to having legislative authority relative to existing small business acts, this committee would be authorized to conduct studies and investigations of the problems of all types of small businesses that now exist or may exist in the future. In this connection, one of the areas where the Committee on Small Business would operate is determining whether Government agencies adequately serve and give due consideration to the problems of small business. It has also become evident that in a good many instances there is an overlapping of programs which often leads to confusion and difficulty for small businesses in dealing with the many respective Government agencies and departments.

I respectfully request that the consideration of the Congress be directed toward legislation which would seek to remedy this present situation.

#### CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LINDSAY] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. LINDSAY. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep personal conviction that I join my colleagues in commemoration of the fifth anniversary of Captive Nations Week. The need for remembering the captive nations of the world, the necessity for strengthening the faith and

hope of these oppressed peoples is immediate and real.

More than 100 million people live in captive nations. Many of these people have given their lives in protest against their captivity. The uprisings in East Berlin in 1953 and in Poland and Hungary in 1956 amply attest to the desire for freedom from the yoke of tyranny.

Communism threatens us today as it did in the 1950's. We must prevent the passage of time from diminishing this yearning for freedom. Mere selfish interest dictates that in the fight between East and West the material resources, the manpower, and the spirit of these ancient nations must be on our side. As long as the people of these countries are in captivity, we cannot be free. And as long as they are slaves to communism, our professions of faith in and devotion to democracy and freedom are empty.

But more than for the sake of self-interest, it is in a humanitarian spirit that we of the United States speak out today. We who live in freedom must remember the captive peoples. Our commitment to freedom compels us to dedicate ourselves to the cause of freedom wherever freedom is denied.

#### SUPREME COURT PRAYER DECISION

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SNYDER] may extend his remarks at this point in the Record and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the Supreme Court's decision barring the reading of the Bible and the saying of the Lord's Prayer in public schools. The Kentucky Legislature, in second extraordinary session, on June 26, 1963, adopted a resolution in this regard which I believe to be worthy of the attention of all Members of this House. This resolution reads as follows:

#### HOUSE RESOLUTION 10

Whereas the Supreme Court decisions barring the reading of the Bible and saying the Lord's Prayer in public schools has gone beyond the intent of the Federal Constitution, and is in disregard of the laws of 37 States of the Union, including the sovereign State of Kentucky; and

Whereas the decision of the highest Court of the land infers that the mere recognition of Almighty God, is in itself, a violation of religious liberty and the reading of the Holy Word is in violation of the law of the land; and

Whereas many millions of Americans join in the opinion of dissent to the High Court's opinion; and

Whereas the majority of the Supreme Court, Earl Warren always included, is soft on communism and hard on religion;

Whereas the reading of the Bible does not establish a church and the recognition of Almighty God by an employee of a State does not tend to unite church and state and therefore is not at variance with the first amendment to the U.S. Constitution; and

Whereas State legislatures and the U.S. Congress say prayers to the Great Master but school personnel are not permitted to call on His name; and



Whereas it is now feared by many of His Elect that all religious aspects of governmental procedures will be banished and the following may soon come to pass:

1. Coins, bearing the inscription, "In God We Trust," will be called in by U.S. Treasury and will no longer be legal tender in the United States of America;

2. All public documents containing any word, phrase, or reference to God, and all such documents on file in all counties, States, and the United States shall be pulled and the word "God" obliterated, marked out or otherwise destroyed;

3. No instrument which must be recorded shall mention the name of the Lord, no testamentary document will be effective which refers to the name of the Most High and no deed of conveyance will be valid which refers to His Holy name;

4. In the year of our Lord will no longer be referred to and B.C. and A.D. will no longer be used in the calculation of time;

5. Inscriptions on public shrines and monuments shall be removed if reference is made to the Deity. This includes the tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington National Cemetery and all tombstones in all Government cemeteries;

6. No longer will chaplains serve in the Army of the United States or religious service be permitted where U.S. soldiers are stationed; and

Whereas certain decisions of the Supreme Court are alien to and inimical to the well-being and spiritual growth of the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the Commonwealth of Kentucky.* That the house go on record opposed to the decisions of the Supreme Court relating to Bible reading and recitation of the Lord's Prayer in public schools in the cases of *School District of Abington Township v. Schempp, et al.*, and *Murray, et al. v. Curlett, et al.*

#### SALARY INCREASES FOR MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MICHEL] may extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, there has been a considerable amount of talk relative to the President's request for salary increases for members of the executive branch. To implement the President's request, he has appointed the Randall committee to study Federal salaries in three particular areas—statutory salary systems, military salary systems, and executive salary systems. This committee has submitted its report to the President; however, the report has not been released, and we do not have at this point the President's updated recommendations to the Congress in legislative form.

The very fact that a considerable amount of discussion has already ensued about the possibility of increases for our own Members prompted me to ask the Library of Congress some time ago to compile a list of Federal, State, and local governmental employees receiving salaries of \$22,500 or more in order that we might have some basis for comparison. I was very disappointed in what meager information was available from

the Library on this subject, and so I set about to gather my own information.

Today I am glad to bring to the attention of the House the fruits of this labor, and I am sure it will make interesting reading.

I might say that this report covers salaries only and does not take into account additional earnings from special expense accounts, living expenses, and fringe benefits which in many cases amounts to several thousand dollars of additional income.

I shall include a bibliography with this report so that all might know of our source material. Included in this material are replies from 35 of the 50 secretaries of state. Because there are 15 States which have not yet responded to our inquiry and because several salary increases are pending for various officials in the several States, this report will be in need of revision and updating from time to time. But to the best of my knowledge, this report is the most comprehensive that has yet been assembled for those salaries of governmental employees at all levels of government which match or exceed what Members of Congress are being paid today.

Mr. Speaker, by way of review it might be well to begin with a very simple résumé of the history of legislative salaries since the year 1789 which is as follows:

#### REVIEW OF LEGISLATION ESTABLISHING CONGRESSIONAL SALARIES

In 1789: \$6 for every day in attendance, plus an allowance of \$6 for every 20 miles given at the beginning and the end of every session by the most usual road from the Congressman's place of residence to the seat of Congress.

In 1818: \$8 for every day in attendance, plus the same travel expenditure as above.

In 1856: \$3,000 per year.

In 1866: \$5,000 per year, plus 20 cents per mile for travel going to and returning from the seat of the Government.

In 1873: \$7,500 per year in lieu of all pay and allowance except actual individual traveling expenses going to and returning from the seat of the Government.

In 1874: The act of 1873 is hereby repealed; pay and mileage revert to the rates fixed by the act of 1866 above.

In 1907: \$7,500 per year; no change in travel allowance.

In 1925: \$10,000 per year; no change in travel allowance.

In 1946: \$12,500 per year, plus \$2,500 expense allowance and no change in travel allowance.

In 1955: \$22,500 per year; no change in travel allowance.

For the sake of simplicity, we have outlined the report in the following way:

#### GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES EARNING \$22,500 OR MORE PER YEAR

##### I. Federal employees:

###### A. Executive.

###### B. Judicial.

###### C. Legislative.

##### II. State employees:

###### A. Executive.

###### 1. Governors.

###### 2. Other administrators.

###### 3. Superintendents of public instruction.

###### 4. Public university presidents, officers, and department heads.

###### B. Judicial.

##### III. County employees:

###### A. Executive.

###### 1. County administrators and other officials.

###### 2. County (or intermediate) superintendents of school districts.

###### B. Judicial.

##### IV. City employees:

###### A. Executive.

###### 1. Mayors and city managers.

###### 2. Other administrators.

###### 3. Public corporations positions.

###### 4. Superintendents of school districts.

###### B. Judicial.

##### Bibliography.

*Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)*

##### Federal employees:

###### Executive:

The President..... \$100,000

Vice President..... 35,000

Administrative Assistants to the President (2)..... 22,500

Director, Bureau of the Budget..... 22,500

Director, Office of Emergency Planning..... 25,000

Director, Office of Science and Technology..... 22,500

Administrator, Agency for International Development... 22,506

Foreign Service:

Chiefs of missions:

Class 1 (19)..... 27,500

Class 2 (28)..... 25,000

Class 3 (36)..... 22,500

Chiefs of aid missions: Class 1 (4)..... 22,500

Secretary of Agriculture..... 25,000

Secretary of Commerce..... 25,000

Secretary of Defense..... 25,000

Deputy Secretary of Defense... 22,500

Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare..... 25,000

Secretary of Interior..... 25,000

Attorney General..... 25,000

Secretary of Labor..... 25,000

Postmaster General..... 25,000

Secretary of State..... 25,000

President's special representative—Department of State... 25,000

Under Secretary of State..... 22,506

Under Secretary for Political Affairs (U.N.)..... 22,506

U.S. representative to the United Nations..... 27,518

Deputy U.S. representative to the United Nations..... 25,002

Deputy U.S. representative to the U.N. Security Council... 25,002

U.S. representative Council of Organization of American States..... 25,002

U.S. representative to the U.N. Economic and Social Council..... 22,506

U.S. representative to the U.N. Trusteeship Council... 22,506

U.S. representative, International Atomic Energy Agency..... 22,506

Chairman, Atomic Energy Commission..... 22,500

Administrator, Federal Aviation Agency..... 22,500

Administrator, National Aeronautical and Space Administration..... 22,500

Comptroller General..... 22,500

Director, U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency... 22,506

Members, Mississippi River Commission (3)..... 22,500

Trade negotiations, special representative..... 27,500

Staff director, Commission on Civil Rights..... 22,500

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## Federal employees—Continued

Judicial:	
Chief Justice.....	\$35,000
Associate Justices (8).....	35,000
Chief judge, Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.....	25,500
Judges (4), Court of Customs and Patent Appeals.....	25,500
Chief judge, Customs Court.....	22,500
Judges (8), Customs Court.....	22,500
Chief judge, Court of Claims.....	25,500
Judges (4), Court of Claims.....	25,500
Circuit judges (78), courts of appeals.....	25,500
District judge, district court.....	23,000
District judges (306).....	22,500
Senior judges (86).....	23,844
Judge, Court of Military Appeals (3).....	25,500
Judges, Tax Court of the United States (16).....	22,500
Territorial Courts (Canal Zone, Guam, Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico).....	22,500
District Court of the District of Columbia:	
Chief judge.....	23,000
Judges (14).....	22,500
Retired judges (2).....	22,500
Legislative:	
Speaker of the House.....	35,000
Members of Congress:	
Senators (100).....	22,500
Representatives (435, plus 1 Resident Commissioner, Puerto Rico).....	22,500
State employees:	
Executive:	
Governors:	
Alabama.....	25,000
Alaska.....	25,000
Arizona.....	22,500
California.....	44,100
Florida.....	22,500
Hawaii.....	27,500
Illinois.....	30,000
Iowa.....	22,500
Michigan.....	27,500
Mississippi.....	25,000
Missouri.....	25,000
New Jersey.....	35,000
New York.....	50,000
North Carolina.....	25,000
Ohio.....	25,000
Oklahoma.....	25,000
Pennsylvania.....	35,000
Rhode Island.....	25,000
Texas.....	25,000
Virginia.....	25,000
Washington.....	22,500
Other administrators:	
Alabama: State hospital superintendent.....	25,000
California:	
Director of finance.....	30,319
Coordinating Council of higher education, director.....	28,248
Attorney general.....	27,300
Resources agency administrator.....	25,000
Health and welfare agency administrator.....	25,000
Highway transportation agency administrator.....	25,000
Youth and adult correction agency administrator.....	25,000
Mental hygiene director.....	24,805
State compensation insurance fund manager.....	22,575
Florida:	
Inter-American Trade: Exposition director.....	50,000
Citrus commission general manager.....	25,000
Georgia: Controller.....	26,145

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## State employees—Continued

Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
Illinois:	
Mental health director.....	\$27,500
Public aid director.....	25,500
Chief highway engineer.....	22,500
Iowa: Mental health director.....	
	25,000
Kansas:	
Institutional management director.....	25,000
Mental health director.....	27,000
Maryland:	
Roads commission chairman.....	25,000
Chief health officer.....	22,500
Mental health director.....	22,500
Massachusetts: Commissioner of education.....	
	25,000
Michigan:	
Child psychiatric institute director.....	23,386
Crippled children commission director.....	24,576
Highway managing director.....	22,655
Medical superintendent (13).....	24,576
Mental health clinic director.....	28,042
Mental health director.....	24,000
Mental health psychiatrist.....	23,386
Mental retardation program director.....	28,042
Psychiatric administrator (3).....	25,724
Public health commissioner.....	22,500
Public health laboratory scientist.....	24,576
Public health medical services director.....	24,576
Personnel director.....	22,655
Mississippi: Tax collector.....	25,000
Missouri: Mental health director.....	25,000
New Mexico: Revenue structure committee chairman.....	
	25,000
New York:	
Executive assistant to Governor.....	27,500
Attorney general.....	27,500
First assistant attorney general.....	22,655
Alcoholic Beverage Control commission chairman.....	25,200
Office of atomic development, director.....	27,300
Director of the budget.....	28,875
Deputy director of the budget.....	24,675
Chief budget examiner (unit No. 1).....	23,159
Chief budget examiner (capital planning and construction unit).....	23,610
Chief budget examiner (research and fiscal policy unit).....	22,560
Civil defense director.....	25,200
General services commissioner.....	27,300
General services deputy commissioner.....	22,575
Commissioner and chairman of the commission for human rights.....	25,200
Commissioner-vice chairman of the commission for human rights.....	23,100
Commissioner of the office for local government.....	25,200

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## State employees—Continued

Executive—Continued	
Other administrators—Continued	
New York—Continued	
Chief of staff to the Governor, commanding general of the New York National Guard.....	\$25,200
Board of parole chairman.....	25,200
State police superintendent.....	25,200
Office of transportation director.....	25,200
Veterans' affairs director.....	23,100
Agriculture and markets commissioner.....	28,875
Comptroller.....	35,000
First deputy comptroller.....	25,200
Deputy comptroller (division of administration).....	22,700
Deputy comptroller (division of audits and accounts).....	22,700
Deputy comptroller (division of municipal affairs).....	22,700
Superintendent of the banking department.....	28,875
First deputy superintendent of banks.....	22,844
President of the civil service commission.....	28,875
Department of commerce commissioner.....	28,875
First deputy commissioner of commerce.....	22,784
Conservation commissioner.....	28,875
Department of correction commissioner.....	28,875
Education commissioner.....	28,875
Deputy commissioner of education.....	25,395
Associate commissioner of education (research).....	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (elementary, secondary, and adult education).....	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (high and professional education).....	23,295
Associate commissioner of education (cultural education and special services).....	23,295
Industrial commissioner.....	25,200
Labor relations board chairman.....	23,100
Workmen's compensation board chairman.....	25,200
Solicitor general.....	25,880
Department of mental hygiene commissioner.....	28,875
Motor vehicles commissioner.....	28,875
Public service commission chairman.....	28,875
Public service commission commissioner (5).....	25,200
Public service commission counsel.....	25,200
First assistant counsel, office of the counsel (Albany), public service commission.....	22,560
Department of public works superintendent.....	25,200
Administrative deputy (public works).....	21,946
Superintendent of operation and maintenance, department of public works.....	22,599
Commissioner of social welfare.....	28,875



## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## State employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Other administrators—Continued

## New York—Continued

Secretary of State	\$28,875
Harness racing commission chairman	23,625
Taxation and finance commissioner, and president of the tax commission	28,875
Tax commissioners (2)	23,100
North Dakota: Hospital superintendent	25,000

## Ohio:

Superintendent of education	25,000
Mental health director	23,500
Highways director	22,500
Oklahoma: Mental health director	24,000
Oregon: Chancellor of education	25,000

## Pennsylvania:

Auditor	22,500
Mental health commissioner	25,000
Lieutenant Governor	22,500
Treasurer	22,500
Internal affairs secretary	22,500
Joint State government commission director	23,000

South Dakota: Superintendent of state hospital for mentally ill	23,600
---	--------

Texas: State banking official	22,500
-------------------------------	--------

Washington: Mental health superintendent	25,000
--	--------

## Superintendent of public instruction:

California	22,500
Maryland	22,500
Massachusetts	25,000
New Jersey	24,500
New York	28,875
Ohio	25,000

## Public university presidents, officers, and department heads:

Alabama:	
University of Alabama, president	27,500
Auburn University, president	24,000
Arizona: University of Arizona, president	22,500

California:	
Coordinating council for higher education, director	28,248

## University of California:

General administration:	
President	38,000
Vice president, finance	26,000
Vice president, government relations	26,000
Vice president, treasurer, and land agent	29,000

University dean, academic planning	22,700
------------------------------------	--------

Berkeley campus: Chancellor	30,000
-----------------------------	--------

Davis campus:	
Chancellor	24,000

Dean of college of agriculture	23,300
--------------------------------	--------

Dean of college of veterinary medicine	23,176
--	--------

Irvine campus: Chancellor	23,000
---------------------------	--------

Los Angeles campus:	
Chancellor	30,000

Dean of college of letters and science	31,072
--	--------

Dean of school of medicine	23,920
----------------------------	--------

Academic dean of graduate division	23,132
------------------------------------	--------

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## State employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Public university—Con.

## California—Continued

University of Calif.—Con.	
San Diego campus:	
Chancellor	\$25,000
Santa Cruz: Chancellor	23,000
Hastings College of Law: Dean	26,189
Trustees of the California State colleges	32,000

## Colorado:

University of Colorado:	
President	27,500
Vice president	23,000
Provost	22,500
Dean of medical school	26,500

Colorado State University: President	24,000
--------------------------------------	--------

Connecticut: University of Connecticut, president	25,000
---	--------

## Florida:

University of Florida, College of Medicine:	
Head, department of psychology	25,000
Head, department of radiology	25,000
Head, department of surgery	25,000

## Georgia:

Medical College of Georgia, president	28,000
---------------------------------------	--------

University of Georgia, president	25,000
----------------------------------	--------

Georgia Institute of Technology, president	25,000
--	--------

Hawaii: University of Hawaii, president	32,800
---	--------

## Illinois:

Eastern State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Normal State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Northern State Teacher's College, president	25,500
Western State Teacher's College, president	25,500

Southern Illinois University:	
President	36,000

Vice president	24,000
Vice president	24,000

University of Illinois:	
President	36,000

Vice president	22,500
Vice president	24,500

Vice president	26,500
Vice president	28,500

Assistant to president	22,500
------------------------	--------

Professors at Chicago and Champaign campuses (14)	22,500-27,500
---	---------------

Deans (11)	22,500-26,000
------------	---------------

Director	23,000
Director	25,500

## Indiana:

Indiana University, president	30,000
-------------------------------	--------

Purdue University, president	30,000
------------------------------	--------

## Iowa:

Iowa State University, president	26,000
----------------------------------	--------

State University of Iowa: President	26,000
-------------------------------------	--------

Head of university hospital	30,000
-----------------------------	--------

## Kansas:

University of Kansas:	
Chancellor	26,000

Chairman, pathology department	25,000
Chairman, radiology department	25,000

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## State employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Public university—Con.

## Kansas—Continued

University of Kansas—Con.	
Chairman, psychiatry department	\$25,000

Chairman, surgery department	25,000
------------------------------	--------

Chairman, obstetrics department	25,000
---------------------------------	--------

Chairman, internal medicine department	25,000
--	--------

Kansas State University, president	26,000
------------------------------------	--------

Louisiana: Louisiana State University, president	25,000
--	--------

Maryland: University of Maryland, president	25,000
---	--------

## Minnesota:

University of Minnesota:	
President	31,500

Vice president, business	25,750
Vice president, academic	25,750

Nebraska: University of Nebraska, chancellor	27,500
--	--------

## New York:

State University of New York:	
President	28,875

Dean, upstate medical college	26,000
-------------------------------	--------

Buffalo College of Education	25,000
------------------------------	--------

City College of New York, president	30,000
-------------------------------------	--------

City College presidents (4)	30,000
-----------------------------	--------

North Carolina: Consolidated University, president	22,500
--	--------

## Ohio:

Ohio State University:	
President	36,000

Vice president, business and finance	26,976
--------------------------------------	--------

Vice president, instruction	26,976
-----------------------------	--------

Dean, medical school	26,952
----------------------	--------

Bowling Green State, president	30,000
--------------------------------	--------

Kent State University, president	25,000
----------------------------------	--------

Miami University, president	25,000
-----------------------------	--------

Ohio University, president	25,000
----------------------------	--------

## Oklahoma:

University of Oklahoma, president	22,500
-----------------------------------	--------

Oklahoma State University, president	22,500
--------------------------------------	--------

Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University, president	36,000
--	--------

## Tennessee:

University of Tennessee:	
President	25,000

Vice president, medical unit	25,000
------------------------------	--------

Utah: University of Utah, president	25,000
-------------------------------------	--------

Washington: University of Washington, president	30,000
---	--------

West Virginia: University of West Virginia, president	30,000
---	--------

## Judicial:

## Alaska:

Supreme court:	
Chief justice	23,500

Associates (2)	22,500
----------------	--------

## California:

Supreme court:	
Chief justice	29,400

Associates (6)	27,300
----------------	--------

District court of appeals:	
Presiding justices (10)	25,200

Associates (20)	25,200
-----------------	--------

Administrative director of courts	25,200
-----------------------------------	--------

Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued

Judicial—Continued	
Connecticut:	
Supreme Court of Errors:	
Chief Justice.....	\$22,500
Delaware:	
Supreme court: Chief justice.....	22,500
Georgia:	
Supreme court: Chief justice.....	22,500
Court of appeals: Chief justice.....	22,500
Hawaii:	
Supreme court: Chief justice.....	22,500
Illinois:	
Supreme court: Justices (7).....	30,000
Circuit court: Justices (20).....	29,000
Superior court: Justices (53).....	29,000
Appellate court: Justices (24).....	25,000
Louisiana:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice.....	25,000
Associates (6).....	22,500
Maryland:	
Court of Appeals:	
Chief Justice.....	25,500
Associates (7).....	25,000
Massachusetts:	
Supreme court: Chief justice.....	23,000
Michigan:	
Supreme court: Justices (8).....	25,500
Minnesota:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice.....	23,500
Associates.....	22,500
Missouri:	
Supreme court: Justices (7).....	22,500
New Jersey:	
Supreme court: Chief justice.....	27,000
Associates (6).....	26,000
New York:	
Court of appeals:	
Chief judge.....	39,000
Associates (6).....	36,500
Appellate divisions, supreme court:	
1st and 2d departments:	
Presiding justice.....	39,000
Associates (13).....	37,500
3d and 4th departments:	
Presiding justice.....	33,000
Associates (13).....	32,500
General trial court:	
Supreme court:	
Justices (80).....	34,500
Justices (20).....	26,000
Court of special sessions:	
Chief justice.....	26,000
Justices (23).....	25,000
Surrogate's court:	
New York City justices (5).....	34,500
Richmond justice.....	33,000
Elsewhere:	
Presiding justice.....	26,000
Justices (22).....	25,000
Domestic relations court:	
Presiding justice.....	30,000
Justices (34).....	25,000
State administrator, Judicial Conference.....	
	31,075
North Carolina:	
Supreme court: chief justice.....	22,500
Pennsylvania:	
Supreme court:	
Chief justice.....	33,000
Associates (6).....	32,500

Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

State employees—Continued

Judicial—Continued	
Pennsylvania—Continued	
Intermediate appellate court:	
Superior court:	
President judge.....	\$31,000
Associates (6).....	30,500
General trial courts:	
Court of Common Pleas:	
Judges (5).....	27,500
Judges (96).....	25,000
Judges (12).....	22,500
Orphans courts: Judges (24).....	25,000
County employees:	
Executive:	
County administrators and other officials:	
California:	
Alameda County: county administrator.....	25,500
Los Angeles County:	
County administrator.....	29,700
County counsel.....	28,464
District attorney.....	26,500
Superintendent of charities.....	28,464
Assessor.....	27,500
Sheriff.....	27,500
Chief engineer.....	26,604
Other positions (9).....	25,176
San Diego County: County administrator.....	
	25,020
San Francisco County:	
County administrator.....	25,200
San Mateo County:	
County administrator.....	25,128
Florida:	
Dade County: Medical examiner.....	25,000
Illinois:	
Cook County:	
District attorney.....	25,000
Superintendent of highways.....	27,960
Director of public aid.....	24,600
Michigan:	
Wayne County:	
General superintendent of hospital.....	24,845
Medical examiner.....	24,845
County (or intermediate) superintendents of school districts:	
Florida: Dade County.....	25,000
Georgia: DeKalb County.....	24,000
Louisiana: Orleans Parish.....	23,000
Maryland: Montgomery County (Rockville).....	23,000
Judicial:	
Illinois:	
Cook County:	
County court judge.....	29,000
Probate judge.....	29,000
Circuit court judge (76).....	29,500
Associate circuit court judge (58).....	28,500
Michigan:	
Wayne County:	
Circuit court judge (18).....	25,501
Probate court judge (5).....	22,500
Records court judge (9).....	24,500
Pennsylvania:	
Allegheny County:	
County court, president judge.....	23,000
County court, associates.....	22,500
Dauphin County: Commonwealth court.....	27,500
Philadelphia County:	
County court, president judge.....	23,000
County court, associates.....	22,500

Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

City employees:

Executive:	
Mayors and city managers:	
Arizona: Phoenix.....	\$25,500
California:	
Anaheim.....	26,796
Burbank.....	26,721
Downey.....	22,800
Fresno.....	26,064
Glendale.....	25,800
Long Beach.....	26,000
Los Angeles.....	25,000
Oakland.....	26,250
Norwalk.....	23,004
Palo Alto.....	26,200
Pasadena.....	29,662
Richmond.....	23,160
Riverside.....	23,100
Sacramento.....	27,600
San Diego.....	28,956
San Francisco.....	32,790
San Jose.....	28,728
San Leandro.....	24,900
San Mateo.....	24,360
Santa Ana.....	22,800
Santa Monica.....	23,000
Connecticut: Hartford.....	22,551
Florida:	
Miami.....	25,000
Miami Beach.....	25,425
St. Petersburg.....	24,000
Illinois: Chicago.....	35,000
Iowa: Des Moines.....	24,000
Kansas: Wichita.....	24,300
Louisiana: New Orleans.....	25,000
Maryland: Baltimore.....	25,000
Michigan: Detroit.....	25,000
Missouri:	
Kansas City.....	27,000
St. Louis.....	25,000
New Jersey: Newark.....	
	25,000
New York:	
New York City.....	50,000
New Rochelle.....	23,000
Rochester.....	23,310
Yonkers.....	22,875
Ohio:	
Cincinnati.....	30,000
Cleveland.....	25,000
Dayton.....	26,643
Toledo.....	25,000
Pennsylvania: Philadelphia.....	
	30,000
Texas:	
Dallas.....	27,610
Houston.....	25,000
San Antonio.....	22,600
Virginia:	
Newport News.....	25,000
Norfolk.....	30,000
Richmond.....	23,160
Washington:	
Spokane.....	24,000
Tacoma.....	22,800
Wisconsin: Milwaukee.....	
	24,000
Other administrators:	
California:	
Long Beach: City attorney.....	23,400
Los Angeles:	
General manager, water and power.....	40,560
General manager, airports.....	35,000
Assistant general manager, water and power.....	33,768
City schools business manager.....	32,565
Chief assistant city attorney.....	31,140
Chief electrical engineer, water and power.....	31,140
Auditor-controller, water and power.....	31,140



## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## City employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Other administrators—Continued

## California—Continued

## Los Angeles—Continued

Chief engineer, water works, water and power.....	\$31,140
General manager, harbor department.....	30,312
City schools controller.....	29,185
Assistant chief electrical engineer, water and power.....	26,568
Assistant chief engineer (2).....	26,568
City schools deputy controller.....	26,165
Operation and maintenance, water and power.....	25,524
Design and construction, water and power.....	25,524
City schools deputy business manager.....	25,143
Chief administrative officer.....	25,050
San Diego:	
Assistant city manager.....	25,020
City attorney.....	25,020
San Francisco:	
Controller.....	30,528
Chief administrative officer.....	28,812
Public utilities.....	26,444
Assessor.....	25,215
District attorney.....	25,215
City attorney.....	25,215
Health officer.....	23,700

## Illinois:

## Chicago:

Administrative officer.....	25,000
Budget director.....	24,000
Chairman and commissioner, urban renewal.....	30,000
Deputy commissioner, urban renewal.....	26,500
Chief engineer.....	24,708
City comptroller.....	24,000
Commissioner of buildings.....	24,000
Commissioner of health.....	25,000
Commissioner of planning.....	24,000
Commissioner of public works.....	25,000
Corporation counsel.....	30,000
Fire commissioner.....	30,000
Medical director, municipal TB sanatorium.....	23,532
Purchasing agent.....	22,500
Superintendent of police.....	30,000

## Massachusetts:

## Boston:

Development administrator.....	30,000
General manager, transit authority.....	40,000
Business manager, transit authority.....	25,000

## Michigan:

Detroit: Health commissioner.....	24,331
-----------------------------------	--------

## Missouri:

## Kansas City:

Hospital director.....	25,000
Radiologist.....	25,500
Pathologist.....	25,500

## St. Louis:

Metropolitan sewer district:	
Executive director.....	25,000
General counsel.....	25,000

## New Jersey:

Newark: Director of hospitals.....	25,000
------------------------------------	--------

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## City employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Other administrators—Continued

## New Mexico:

Albuquerque: City attorney.....	\$24,444
New York:	
New York City:	
Controller.....	40,000
Borough presidents (5).....	35,000
City council president.....	35,000
Chairman, housing authority.....	35,000
Chairman, transit authority.....	35,000
District attorney (4).....	34,500
Executive deputy superintendent of schools.....	32,500
Deputy mayor.....	30,000
City administrator.....	30,000
Deputy superintendents.....	27,500
Commissioner of traffic.....	27,500
Members, transit authority (2).....	27,500
General manager, transit authority.....	27,500
Executive secretary to mayor.....	25,000
Assistant to the mayor.....	25,000
Corporation counsel.....	25,000
First deputy controller.....	25,000
Budget bureau director.....	25,000
Commissioner of hospitals.....	25,000
Hospital directors of service (10).....	25,000
Fire commissioner.....	25,000
Police commissioner.....	25,000
Commissioner of public works.....	25,000
Commissioner of sanitation.....	25,000
Commissioner of parks.....	25,000
General counsel, transit authority.....	25,000
Chairman of housing and redevelopment.....	25,000
Director of personnel.....	25,000

## Pennsylvania:

Philadelphia:	
Managing director.....	26,500
Director of finance.....	26,500
City solicitor.....	26,500
City representative.....	26,500
Executive director, general hospital.....	25,000
Street commissioner.....	24,000
Water commissioner and city engineer.....	24,000

## Texas:

Dallas: City attorney.....	22,700
----------------------------	--------

## Public corporations positions:

## California:

East Bay Municipal Utility District:	
General manager.....	33,600
Attorney.....	27,600

Louisiana: Director, port of New Orleans.....	40,000
---	--------

## New York:

Port of New York Authority:	
Executive director.....	60,000
Deputy executive director.....	45,000
General counsel.....	45,000
Chief engineer.....	45,000
Director, finance.....	40,000
Director, marine terminals.....	40,000
Director, port development.....	40,000
Director, aviation.....	40,000
Director, administration.....	35,000
Director, public relations.....	35,000

## Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## City employees—Continued

## Executive—Continued

## Public corporations positions—Con.

## New York—Continued

Port Authority—Continued	
Director, personnel.....	\$33,300
Director, tunnels and bridges.....	33,300
General attorney.....	33,000
First deputy director, aviation.....	33,000
General solicitor.....	33,000
Controller.....	31,350
Director, terminals.....	31,000
Director, world trade.....	30,000
Deputy director, port development.....	29,500
Deputy chief engineer.....	29,000
Deputy director, marine terminals.....	28,400
Engineer of construction.....	28,000
Deputy director, transportation policy.....	27,500
Chief architect.....	27,500
Deputy director, aviation.....	27,000
Deputy director, real estate.....	27,000
Assistant chief engineer, design.....	26,000
Deputy director, operations service.....	25,558
Chief, port commerce.....	25,558
Engineer, research and development.....	25,536
Deputy director, tunnels and bridges.....	25,000
Triboro Bridge and Tunnel Authority:	
General manager.....	45,000
Assistant general manager.....	37,500
Counsel.....	32,000
Assistant civil engineer.....	26,000
Pennsylvania: Delaware River Basin Commission: Executive director.....	25,000
South Carolina: South Carolina Public Service Authority: General manager.....	25,000
Texas: Lower Colorado River Authority: General manager.....	25,000
Superintendents of school districts:	
Arizona:	
Phoenix Union High School District.....	24,000
Tucson.....	25,675
California:	
Concord (Mount Diablo USD).....	24,000
Covina.....	24,000
Fremont Union High School (Sunnyvale).....	23,200
Fresno.....	25,110
Fullerton Union High School.....	23,000
Glendale.....	25,000
Hayward Union High School.....	23,535
Inglewood.....	23,500
Montebello Unified.....	23,500
Long Beach.....	26,000
Los Angeles:	
Superintendent of district.....	35,000
Associate superintendent.....	29,767
Assistant superintendent.....	26,674
Norwalk-La Mirada.....	24,000
Oakland.....	26,250
Palo Alto.....	23,000
Pasadena.....	26,000
Richmond.....	22,726

Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## City—Continued

## Superintendents—Continued

## California—Continued

Riverside.....	\$22,500
Sacramento.....	23,750
San Bernardino.....	24,425
San Diego:	
Superintendent.....	28,392
Associate superintend-	
ent.....	24,528
San Francisco.....	31,000
Sequoia Union High School	
(Redwood City).....	23,000
Torrance.....	23,000
Whittier Union High	
School.....	24,000
Colorado: Denver.....	29,000
Connecticut: New Haven	
area (Greenwich).....	23,500

## Illinois:

Chicago:	
Superintendent.....	48,500
Associate superintend-	
ent.....	27,600
Highland Park H.S. No.	
108.....	24,000
New Trier Township High	
School District (Winnet-	
ka.....	27,500
Niles Township High	
School District No. 219	
(Skokie).....	23,500
Lyons Township High	
School District (La	
Grange).....	25,500
Oak Park-River Forest	
High School District	
(Oak Park).....	24,500
Winnetka EDS.....	22,500
Indiana: Gary.....	24,000
Iowa: Davenport.....	24,500

## Kansas:

Wichita.....	22,500
Shawnee Mission Rural	
High School District No.	
6.....	23,500
Maryland: Baltimore.....	25,000
Massachusetts: Boston.....	25,000

## Michigan:

Detroit.....	33,000
Flint.....	27,500
Grosse Pointe.....	23,500

## Minnesota:

Minneapolis.....	28,000
St. Paul.....	22,500

## Missouri:

Ladue.....	26,500
Kansas City.....	24,000
St. Louis.....	25,000
University City.....	22,500

## Nebraska: Omaha.....

New Jersey: Newark..... 24,000

New Mexico: Albuquerque..... 22,500

## New York:

Buffalo.....	24,000
East Meadow.....	24,000
East Rockaway.....	23,000
Farmingdale.....	23,000
Garden City.....	25,500
Great Neck.....	29,000
Hewlett.....	23,240
Huntington—Union Free	
School District No. 3.....	24,000
Kenmore District, Tona-	
wanda.....	23,065
Mount Vernon.....	23,760
New York City:	
Superintendent.....	37,500
Associate superintend-	
ent.....	27,500
Assistant superintend-	
ent.....	23,645
Director.....	23,645
New Rochelle.....	24,000
Oyster Bay School District	
No. 2 (Syosset).....	25,000
Plainview.....	23,000

Government employees earning \$22,500 or more per year (Federal, State, local)—Con.

## City—Continued

## Superintendents—Continued

## New York—Continued

Port Washington.....	\$22,500
Rochester.....	24,500
Roslyn.....	25,000
Scarsdale.....	26,500
Schenectady.....	22,550
White Plains.....	24,500
Yonkers.....	23,145

## Ohio:

Akron.....	25,000
Cincinnati.....	30,000
Cleveland.....	25,000
Columbus.....	25,000
Dayton.....	22,625

## Oregon:

Portland.....	23,400
---------------	--------

## Pennsylvania:

Abington Township High	
School.....	24,000
Lower Merion School Dis-	
trict (Ardmore).....	22,500
Philadelphia.....	27,500
Pittsburgh.....	30,000

## Texas:

Dallas.....	33,000
Fort Worth.....	24,000
Houston.....	27,500
San Antonio.....	25,000
Spring Branch ISD (Hous-	
ton).....	22,500
Virginia: Richmond.....	23,160
Washington: Seattle.....	24,000
Wisconsin: Milwaukee.....	29,000

## Judicial:

## Illinois:

Chicago:	
Municipal court:	
Chief judge.....	25,000
Associates (12).....	22,500

## Michigan:

Detroit:	
Recorder's court traffic	
judge.....	24,500
Court of common pleas	
judges.....	25,000

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

American Federation of Teachers. Superintendents' Salaries, 1962.

Fennell, Margaret. Positions Requiring Appointment by the President, revised December 1962.

International City Manager's Association. Municipal Yearbook, 1962.

National Association of Counties. Salaries of Selected County Officials (Counties of Approximately 1 Million Population), October 1962.

National Association of County Officials. County Administrator Salaries, October 1962.

National Education Association. Salary Schedule Maximums for Administrators, 1962-63, School Systems Having 600 or More Pupils, February 1963.

National Education Association. Salary Schedule Maximums for School Administrators, 1961-62, Urban Districts 100,000 and Over in Population, 1961.

Public Personnel Association. Executive Compensation in Public Service (California), April 1960.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. Pay Rates of \$25,000 or More in State and Local Government, March 1963.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. Salary Rates or Salary Limitations Fixed by Congress for Individual Positions in the Executive Branch, December 1962.

California State Budget, fiscal 1963.

Illinois Budget, fiscal 1962 and 1963.

Information from the secretaries of state of all 50 States in response to a request of July 2, 1963.

Journal of the American Judicature Society. "State and Federal Judicial Salary

Summaries," vol. 45, No. 10, March 1962, 241-263.

New York State Budget, fiscal 1964.

The Book of the States, 1962-63.

"Study Report of Special Committee on Elected Officials' Salaries (City of Milwaukee)," 1960.

U.S. Civil Service Commission. The Federal Top Salary Network, revised April 1963.

## AMERICAN HEART MONTH—HEART AND BLOOD VESSEL DISEASES

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FOGARTY] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, this Nation's No. 1 health enemy is the heart and blood vessel diseases, a broad complex of diseases and disorders including heart attack and stroke, rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, in-born heart defects, high blood pressure and other complications of hardening of the arteries, varicose veins, congestive heart failure, endocarditis, peripheral vascular disease, heart disease caused by diphtheria, thyroid, kidney, and other organic disorders, and many other heart and circulatory conditions.

These diseases account for approximately 950,000 deaths in the United States in a year. This is more than the total number of deaths from all other causes combined.

Additionally, considerably more than 10 million living Americans are afflicted in varying degrees by one or another of these disorders. Men and women, young and old, employers and employees—all are subject to these diseases. They play no favorites.

Medical science is making a militant attack on this great health problem and encouraging progress is being made through research underwritten by public contributions to the Heart Fund and by Government support through the Heart Institute. Such research in recent years has developed vital new knowledge to improve diagnostic techniques so that heart disease victims can be discovered more rapidly and be given earlier treatment that has also been vastly advanced in the past generation.

Thus, it is now possible for most heart attack victims to recover from first attacks, three out of four who do so being able to return to their jobs; new treatment and new methods of rehabilitation now can reduce or prevent invalidism from stroke; rheumatic fever and rheumatic heart disease, major childhood menaces, can be made preventable diseases; most cases of high blood pressure now can be controlled, reducing damage and threat of damage to the heart, brain, and kidneys; and, of historic value, many defects of the heart itself and its great vessels, hopeless only a few years ago, now are correctable through dramatic advances in surgery.

By themselves, however, research advances are mere academic victories. It



is necessary to communicate them to the physicians of the Nation and to the public so that they can be properly applied to lengthening and saving the lives of victims of these diseases. Thus, the job of communication is imperative. This job is also twofold. First, the truths about the dangers of the heart diseases, and the great complexity of this problem, must be brought to the people, misinformation dispelled, and hope and encouragement created. Secondly, all of us must be made aware of the facts that these diseases now can be controlled better than ever before, that risks can be reduced, that preventive steps can be undertaken, and that early discovery and early treatment can spell the difference between a full, useful, productive life on the one hand and protracted illness and unnecessarily early death on the other.

One of the truly valuable results of the campaign the American Heart Association carries on nationally each February is the furtherance of this important communication need. The Heart Association campaign focuses a public-informational spotlight on the heart disease problem through a concerted effort to win the support of all media—newspaper, magazine, and broadcasting—during this period. And, additionally, it attracts to its ranks more than 1½ million volunteers throughout the month to carry the heart story into the homes of our citizens everywhere by distributing authoritative brochures and pamphlets.

Because February has become so important in the crusade that science is conducting against these treacherous diseases, every effort should be made to highlight its importance in the eyes of all Americans. It is for this reason that I am proposing to this body for its approval a request that the President of the United States be authorized and requested to issue annually a proclamation designating February as American Heart Month, inviting the Governors of the States and territories to issue proclamations for like purposes, and urging the people of the Nation to give heed to the nationwide problem of the heart and blood vessel diseases and to support all essential programs required to solve it.

#### FARM LABOR PROBLEM

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GONZALEZ] may extend his remarks at this point and include extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, lately we have heard proponents of Public Law 78 issue some claims for that so-called humanitarian solution to our farm labor problem.

To our argument that the influx of foreign labor decreases domestic wages by increasing the supply of labor, they say, "But the Labor Department allows no braceros to work in the U.S. for less

than the minimum adverse-effect wage set by the Department."

True enough, the Labor Department does set an adverse-effect wage so that supposedly the domestic wage is not depressed. But let us look at this situation more closely.

Prior to 1962 there was no attempt to prohibit the bracero program from adversely affecting domestic wages. The simple fact is that domestic migrants' wages were then lower than what they would have been without Public Law 78. That conclusion is simple supply-and-demand analysis, supplemented by the fact that braceros can live much more cheaply than can domestic migrants.

Farm wages were thus depressed before any concrete and practical adverse-effect provision was put into practice. In March, 1962, therefore, when the Labor Department set the minimum wage for braceros, it was taking an average wage for an occupation already depressed by a cheap foreign labor supply.

This is the built-in adverse effect of any bracero program. It remains whether the Labor Department requires growers to hire all domestics seeking work at that wage or not. It remains whether the Labor Department now sets an adverse-effect wage or not.

I invite those who claim that sufficient domestic laborers can never be procured for stoop labor to examine the successful program established by communities in Washington and Oregon to supply all growers with seasonal domestic labor. This takes concerted efforts by communities. It requires a higher wage and better living conditions. But the fact remains that it has worked.

#### A BEAUTIFUL LIFE IS A GREAT BLESSING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LIBONATI). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HALPERN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound sorrow that I rise to pay tribute to one of the finest human beings I have ever been privileged to know—the late William K. Dorfman of Forest Hills, N.Y. If ever an American's life and works were worthy of recognition in this House, his merit this honor.

Hence, Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments to talk about Bill Dorfman, my dear friend whose untimely passing occurred last March 12. Few persons leave behind them such a record of dedicated service to humanity. Although he earned a worldwide reputation for his work in behalf of the Zionist Organization of America, the everyday kindnesses and deeds of humanity which he habitually demonstrated, will never be forgotten. Personally, I can say that my life has been greatly enriched in having known Bill Dorfman and sharing a deep and beautiful friendship with him. Countless others, I am sure, feel the same way.

To Bill Dorfman's lovely wife, Rose, and his fine family, I extend my sincere sympathy. Mrs. Dorfman was a con-

stant inspiration to her husband, as she dedicated herself to the causes in which he so avowedly believed. She is former president of the Queens region of the Hadassah, the women's Zionist organization, and has gained a national reputation for her work in this group and in other good causes.

Mr. Dorfman was a native of New York City and at an early age became associated with the aspirations of the homeless Jewish people to rebuild their ancestral homeland. To the Zionist movement he gave his constant support and because of his outstanding contributions many honors came his way. But he never forgot the little deeds that make for lasting friendship. He was never too busy to assist in solving the problems of his friends and neighbors. He was a man of tender compassion.

An essay by Max Nordau entitled "On Life and Death" has been translated from the Hebrew by Max Chaitman and appeared in the 29th Annual Convention Manual of the Long Island Zionist Region in June of this year. This essay is so poignant and reflects much of what I feel about my dear friend, Bill Dorfman, that I want to bring you a part of it:

At the foot of a gigantic mountain whose head was constantly covered with snow there lay a tranquil valley. Near the valley there flowed a lively stream. And the stream washed the roots of a very old oak tree. The face of the tree was reflected in the water. In the shade of the oak tree grew a variety of flowers and on the top of the tree nested an old and wise owl.

On a hot summer's day the flowers stopped blooming, their petals withered and complaints were heard among the flowers concerning their fate. "How unfortunate we flowers are and how bitter is our fate. \* \* \* Only for a short while do we enjoy the singing of the birds. \* \* \* A thousand times more fortunate is this oak tree whose rustling branches make us all tremble with their mighty sound. \* \* \* She still lives and who knows how many more thousands of years she will live and enjoy the pleasantness of the spring."

The little flower who spoke became silent and a strong wind passed through the branches of the old oak tree and the tree chastised the flower who spoke. "As you understand, thus you speak. The truth is that my life is longer than yours, but you are greatly in error when you envy me. \* \* \* Your life is devoid of sorrow and every moment of your life is a joy. You know only the joys of the spring and the pleasantness of the early summer. The sorrow of the winter is not known to you. You have no enemies. \* \* \* But I, from early youth, had to carry on a war with a host of enemies that sought to destroy me. \* \* \* If you desire to envy the fate of someone who will truly live forever, then choose to envy the fate of this great mountain that is above us, and not my fate."

Deep silence fell for a brief moment. Then there was a great uproar on the mountain. The mountain began to speak: "Oh you mighty tree, I see that years have not given you any wisdom. You are not wiser than this little blue flower. There is nothing on earth that is eternal. The earth itself is not eternal. \* \* \* I do not think much, and I dream empty dreams. My time passes without purpose. I hardly notice what happens around me. Everything to me is empty and void. Oh, how I wish to be like you, or even to be like the little flowers that grow

nearby. All of you see life for a while. I see nothing."

At that moment the wise owl that lived on the treetop and was listening to all this screamed and in a loud voice asked the mountain, the oak tree, and the little flower to look at the waters of the stream. Upon the face of the water there appeared a host of tiny creatures. They were day flies that had just been hatched. They spread their frail wings and drank from the soft sweet breeze and they washed their tiny bodies in the warm sunshine. Then they began to dance—individually, in twos, or in groups. They were not concerned about things that were before them, nor about things that were to come after them. That moment was a moment of abundance for them. They were lost in their ecstasy until the day turned and disappeared. They folded their wings and began to descend upon the face of the stream. The joyful thoughts of that wonderful day began to fade little by little. Everything around them began to disintegrate, and they began to sleep a sweet sleep, satisfied like children who played and got tired. But they were not sleeping, for they were dead. When their dead bodies covered the surface of the stream, the wise owl said this to the mountain, the oak tree, and the flower: "A short life or a long life, that does not add or detract. A beautiful life is a great blessing."

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for today, on account of official business.

To Mr. MATHIAS (at the request of Mr. HALLECK), for today, on account of official business.

#### SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

Mr. RYAN of New York for 10 minutes today, and to revise and extend his remarks.

Mr. Bow, for 30 minutes, on Monday next.

Mr. CURTIS, for 1 hour, today.

Mr. RUMSFELD, for 1 hour on Tuesday next.

Mr. CURTIS (at the request of Mr. SIBAL), for 1 hour, on Monday, July 22.

Mr. HALPERN (at the request of Mr. SIBAL), for 15 minutes, today.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to extend remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. DORN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey.

Mr. ST. ONGE.

Mr. MILLER of California to revise and extend his remarks made in Committee of the Whole and to include a letter received from Mr. Webb.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. SIBAL) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SIBAL.

Mr. McLOSKEY.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BROWN of California) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. DENT.

Mr. CAREY in two instances.

Mr. FLOOD.

Mr. ROUSH.

Mr. DANIELS.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 582. An act to extend for 2 years the definition of "peanuts" which is now in effect under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BURLESON, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 3845. An act to amend the Lead-Zinc Small Producers Stabilization Act of October 3, 1961 (75 Stat. 766); and

H.R. 2998. An act to amend titles 10, 14, and 38, United States Code, with respect to the award of certain medals and the Medal of Honor Roll.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 22, 1963, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1049. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, relative to the message of the President of today, July 18, and his recommendation of the imposition of a special excise tax, called an interest equalization tax; and submitting certain information and detailed explanation of the interest equalization tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1050. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a report on the review of the construction of a U.S. Embassy office building and an adjacent ambassadorial residence at Rabat, Morocco; to the Committee on Government Operations.

1051. A letter from the Administrator, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting a report to the Committee on Science and Astronautics of the House of Representatives pursuant to section 1(c) of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Authorization Act for the fiscal year 1963 (76 Stat. 382); to the Committee on Science and Astronautics.

1052. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to relieve the Veterans' Administration from paying interest on the amount of capital funds transferred in fiscal year 1962 from the direct loan revolving fund to the loan guarantee revolving fund"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1053. A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, Department of the Army, dated May 31, 1963, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a letter report on St. Michaels, Talbot County, Md., authorized by the River and Harbor Act approved July 24, 1946; to the Committee on Public Works.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. BUCKLEY: Committee on Public Works. S. 254. An act to provide for the acquisition of certain property in square 758 in the District of Columbia, as an addition to the grounds of the U.S. Supreme Court Building; without amendment (Rept. No. 560). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 489. An act to amend the act of March 5, 1938, establishing a small claims and conciliation branch in the municipal court for the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 561). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 490. An act to amend the act of July 2, 1940, as amended, relating to the recording of liens on motor vehicles and trailers registered in the District of Columbia, so as to eliminate the requirement that an alphabetical file on such liens be maintained; without amendment (Rept. No. 562). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6353. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 563). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6128. A bill to amend section 15 of the Life Insurance Act to permit any stock life insurance company in the District of Columbia to maintain its record of stockholders at its principal place of business in the District of Columbia or at the office of its designated stock transfer agent in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 564). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. McMILLAN: Committee on the District of Columbia. H.R. 6350. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the regulation of the practice of dentistry in the District of Columbia, and for the protection of the people from empiricism in relation thereto", approved June 6, 1892, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 565). Referred to the House Calendar.



## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey:

H.R. 7643. A bill to repeal section 4 of the act of July 29, 1892, relating to the prohibition against flying kites, balloons, or parachutes in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ASHLEY:

H.R. 7644. A bill to amend the Arms Control and Disarmament Act in order to increase the authorization for appropriations and to modify the personnel security procedures for contractor employees; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. AVERY:

H.R. 7645. A bill to designate the Perry Dam and Reservoir, Delaware River, Kans., as the Ozawie Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. BAKER:

H.R. 7646. A bill to amend title II of the Social Security Act to permit ministers who were formerly entitled to railroad retirement annuities, but whose entitlement was subsequently invalidated, to elect to use their social security credits to reestablish their right to such annuities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BARRY:

H.R. 7647. A bill to amend section 213 of the National Housing Act to place the Federal Housing Administration cooperative housing mortgage insurance program on a mutual basis; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BERRY:

H.R. 7648. A bill to amend section 661 of title 18 of the United States Code to provide that the punishment for larceny of livestock shall be the same as the punishment for larceny of property of a value exceeding \$100; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BROWN of California:

H.R. 7649. A bill to amend the National Defense Education Act of 1958 in order to permit funds appropriated under title III of that act to be used for the acquisition of equipment for use in teaching the English language to students whose primary language is not English; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia:

H.R. 7650. A bill to amend the joint resolution of September 15, 1960, with respect to the use of certain park roads, highways, and vehicular facilities by those carriers of passengers by motor vehicles which are certificated by the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CELLER:

H.R. 7651. A bill to provide authority to protect heads of foreign states and other officials; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CLEVELAND:

H.R. 7652. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to remove the tax on toll telephone service and telegraph service to or from points outside the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLSWORTH:

H.R. 7653. A bill to designate the Perry Dam and Reservoir, Delaware River, Kans., as the Ozawie Dam and Reservoir; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. FALLON:

H.R. 7654. A bill to designate the new lock on the St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as the John A. Blatnik lock; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 7655. A bill to amend section 4 of the act of May 13, 1954, commonly referred to as the St. Lawrence Seaway Act, to pro-

vide that the St. Lawrence Seaway Development Corporation shall not engage in certain activities; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. GILBERT:

H.R. 7656. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. HAGAN of Georgia:

H.R. 7657. A bill to amend the criminal laws of the United States to prohibit any person from crossing State lines for the purpose of violating the laws of any State; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HARRISON:

H.R. 7658. A bill to provide for the allocation of a certain percentage of the proceeds from lands in the national park system, situated in Teton County, Wyo., to the State of Wyoming for use by it in compensating Teton County; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HEALEY:

H.R. 7659. A bill to adjust the rates of basic compensation of certain officers and employees in the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. MURPHY of New York:

H.R. 7660. A bill to amend section 5899 of title 10, United States Code, to provide permanent authority under which Naval Reserve officers in the grade of captain shall be eligible for consideration for promotion when their running mates are eligible for consideration for promotion; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. O'HARA of Illinois:

H.R. 7661. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches, work measurement programs, or other performance standards operations as measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. O'HARA of Michigan:

H.R. 7662. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide appeal rights to employees of the Canal Zone Government and the Panama Canal Company; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. PERKINS:

H.R. 7663. A bill to provide readjustment assistance to veterans who serve in the Armed Forces during the induction period; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RODINO:

H.R. 7664. A bill to incorporate the Catholic War Veterans of the United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ROUBEUSH:

H.R. 7665. A bill to amend title I of the Housing Act of 1949 to authorize additional relocation payments to displaced individuals and families in hardship cases, and to include in such payments to displaced business concerns a reasonable allowance for losses of good will and profit; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 7666. A bill to prohibit the designation of any place as off limits to members of the Armed Forces solely because it is segregated; to the Committee on Armed Services.

H.R. 7667. A bill to authorize the offering of prayers in schools on military reservations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. ST. ONGE:

H.R. 7668. A bill declaring October 12 to be a legal holiday, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WESTLAND (by request):

H.R. 7669. A bill to remove restrictions upon the free entrance to the United States

of citizens of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of California:

H.R. 7670. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that motion pictures photographed outside the United States, and any advertisements thereof, shall set forth the country of origin; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RYAN of New York:

H.R. 7671. A bill to prevent the use of stopwatches or other measuring devices in the postal service; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. BURKHALTER:

H.R. 7672. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act to require that advertisements of motion pictures photographed outside the United States set forth the country of origin, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 562. Joint resolution to provide for the designation of the month of February in each year as "American Heart Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PIKE:

H.J. Res. 563. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebion in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LIBONATI:

H.J. Res. 564. Joint resolution authorizing the continued shipment of the drug Krebion in interstate commerce in order to insure the continued availability of such drug for the treatment of patients now being treated with such drug and for terminal cancer patients; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BARING:

H. Con. Res. 198. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BERRY:

H. Con. Res. 199. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHENOWETH:

H. Con. Res. 200. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of California:

H. Con. Res. 201. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress on the need for a healthy domestic gold mining industry; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. BOB WILSON:

H. Con. Res. 202. Concurrent resolution providing for a congressional code of ethics; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. FALLON:

H. Res. 445. Resolution establishing a Special Committee on the Captive Nations; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LANGEN:

H. Res. 446. Resolution creating a standing Committee on Small Business in the House of Representatives, and to grant it full authority in legislative matters; to the Committee on Rules.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Illinois, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to the high and frequently excessive charges made for housing occupied by public assistance recipients, particularly in the metropolitan areas, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the Territory of Guam, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to expressing appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HERBERT C. BONNER, for sponsoring the bill H.R. 7028; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDABBO:

H.R. 7673. A bill for the relief of Georgios V. Banakos; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRADEMAS:

H.R. 7674. A bill for the relief of Victor Lu Hsung Yen; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 7675. A bill for the relief of Jefferson Loan Co., Inc., and Jefferson Mortgage Co., Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD:

H.R. 7676. A bill for the relief of Miss Amalia Salvaterra; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN:

H.R. 7677. A bill for the relief of Inger J. Ladegaard; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7678. A bill for the relief of Dr. Nathaniel Y. Cualoping, and his wife, Dr. Lourdes Cualoping; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 7679. A bill for the relief of Isaac Fuad Roubeln; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PUCINSKI:

H.R. 7680. A bill for the relief of Mieszylaw Rutyna; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STINSON:

H.R. 7681. A bill for the relief of Patricia A. Williams; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### The Passamaquoddy Project To Harness the Tides

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ROBERT T. MCLOSKEY**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. MCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, on May 1 I warned that the plans of Secretary of Interior, Stewart Udall, for connecting all Western Federal power lines into one gigantic "grid of grief" constituted a "Kilowatt Kremlin" for the United States. Now I see where he has recommended the expenditure of \$800 million of the taxpayers' money on the Passamaquoddy project in Maine to harness the tides.

This project would only be in use for some 800 hours per year, which constitutes a cost of some \$1 million per hour. If this project was feasible, it would be another matter. Yet countless recommendations, the last in 1961, have declared the project unfeasible. Canada has refused to participate in the entire project—but Udall has brought them in through the backdoor by saying that we will build it and they will have to buy the power generated from the operation.

It would seem that politics has entered into what should be dispassionate consideration of projects on their own merit. Since a Democratic Senator is up for reelection in Maine next year, the taxpayers must pay for a nearly \$1 billion boondoggle because of Secretary Udall's zealous activity to ride roughshod over private interests and spread Government control through both power plays and land grabs.

This power project has been suggested by Mr. Udall along with Federal land-grabs ranging from the Sleeping Bear Dunes in Michigan to Assateague Island in Maryland which would dispossess thousands of private businessmen, landowners and homeowners with little or no justification. The only justification

for such projects has been Mr. Udall's statements that we must think big and act big. To me all this means is that Americans must pay big—for projects using the people's money to build a political empire and to compete with private power companies and our free enterprise system. One thing Secretary Udall did not learn in Russia was to let "sleeping bears" lie.

### Captive Nations Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. HUGH L. CAREY**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the fifth annual observance of Captive Nations Week, and I am happy to join my distinguished colleagues in commemorating this significant event.

Seven years have passed since the dramatic upheavals in Eastern Europe during 1956 focused public attention on the plight of the 100 million people behind the Iron Curtain. For us in the free world the events of 1956 proved to be an extremely painful experience, for we had to stand by helpless as the freedom fighters of Poznan, Budapest and elsewhere struggled against great odds to throw off the yoke of a hated oppressor—the Soviet Union. We could do nothing to prevent the Red Army from brutally suppressing these revolts. Nor could we encourage more widespread anti-Soviet revolutions in the captive nations knowing that bloody reprisals would be forthcoming. We were caught in a dilemma: We wanted to help the captive peoples in their struggle for independence and liberty, yet we were unable to give effective assistance for fear of triggering world war III.

Today we still face this dilemma, although it is not posed in such stark terms

as during the uprising of 1956. Developments in the Communist satellites since then have brought us to realize that the eventual liberation of these captive peoples will probably result from evolution instead of revolution. It must be our task to further this process by constantly voicing our concern for their fate and by encouraging greater autonomy from the Kremlin. Above all, we must maintain our steadfast dedication to the goal expressed in President Kennedy's Captive Nations Week proclamation—the fulfillment of "the just aspirations of all people for national independence and human liberty."

### Captive Nations Week

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. ABNER W. SIBAL**

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 18, 1963

Mr. SIBAL. Mr. Speaker, the history of tyranny holds no greater story of oppression, for size, extent and cruelty, than that of the peoples we designate as captive nations. No colonial power or combination of powers has ever touched the scale of enslavement like that by which the harsh hand of colonial communism directly grasps the lives of nearly half the world and threatens the peace and welfare of the other half.

The brutal Communist suppression of human rights is the central political and moral fact in the world today. It is this fact which underlies all the basic tensions suffered by the world and pervades and hobbles all international efforts to seek peace. It is my conviction that peace will be impossible until this dark influence is overcome and once-free peoples can breathe free air again, in charge of their own destinies. At this time in history, we should be wary of Soviet ventures into friendliness with us. We know they are driven by fear of the divisions in their own camp. We ought